ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 6/17/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER ED000061

2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). 7399

3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

4. AUTHOR(S): Jamrich, John X.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Faculties of the Michigan Institutions of Higher Education

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: Staff Study No. 10, The Survey of Higher Edu. in Mich.

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. MLSCHE
ST. PO Box 240
CITY, STATE Lansing, Mich.
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	58	204

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR survey

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

teachers	salaries			
rank	qualifications			
degrees	surveys			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

A statistical study of instructional service, academic rank, academic degrees held, level of instructional service, and salaries of faculty members.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

3-9 R #7399

V

Reporter 5/

Clearinghouse of Studies on Higher Education

HE7399

FACULTIES OF THE MICHIGAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Staff Study No. 10

THE SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

LANSING, MICHIGAN

June 1958

ED000061

FACULTIES OF THE
MICHIGAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

by

John X. Jamrich
Assistant Director of the Survey

Staff Study No. 10

The Survey of Higher Education in Michigan

John Dale Russell
Director of the Survey

Prepared for the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education
P.O. Box 240, State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan

June 1958

Publications Issued (to June, 1958) in

THE SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

Preliminary Report to the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, by John Dale Russell, March, 1957

Staff Study No. 1, The Community College in Michigan, by S. V. Martorana, June, 1957

Staff Study No. 2, Geographic Origins of Michigan College Students, by John Dale Russell and Orvin T. Richardson, August, 1957

Staff Study No. 3, Education in Medicine and Nursing in Michigan, by Dr. W. T. Sanger, December, 1957

Staff Study No. 4, Physical Plant Needs in the State-controlled Institutions of Higher Education in Michigan, by Earl W. Anderson and Elden B. Sessions, January, 1958

Staff Study No. 5, Student Personnel Services in the Publicly Controlled Colleges and Universities in Michigan, by Orvin T. Richardson, February, 1958

Staff Study No. 6, Instructional Programs in Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, by John Dale Russell, John X. Jamrich, and Orvin T. Richardson, March, 1958

Staff Study No. 7, Extension and Field Services in the State-controlled Colleges and Universities in Michigan, by Julius M. Nolte and Robert Bell Browne, April, 1958

Staff Study No. 8, Financial Assistance to Students in Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, by John X. Jamrich, May, 1958

Staff Study No. 9, Space Utilization and Value of Physical Plants in Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, by John Dale Russell and John X. Jamrich, June, 1958

Copies of these publications may be obtained, subject to the availability of the supply, on request from the office of the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, P.O. Box 240 (Fourth Floor, State Capitol), Lansing, Michigan.

MEMBERS OF THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATIVE STUDY COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Senators:

- Frank Andrews
- Frank D. Beadle
- Patrick J. Doyle
- Clyde H. Geerlings, Vice Chairman
- Edward Hutchinson

Representatives:

- Charles A. Boyer, Chairman
- Arnell Engstrom
- Allison Green
- John J. Penczak
- Frank D. Williams

MEMBERS OF THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

George W. Dean, President, Michigan Federation of Labor, Lansing

S. D. Den Uyl, President, Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation, Detroit

Merritt D. Hill, General Manager, Tractor and Implement Division, Ford Motor Company, Birmingham

Benjamin Levinson, President, Franklin Mortgage Corporation, Detroit

W. D. Merrifield, Director of Industrial Education, Chrysler Corporation, Detroit

Stephen S. Nisbet, Vice President -- Public Relations, Gerber Products Company, Fremont

Stanley M. Powell, Legislative Counsel, Michigan Farm Bureau, Ionia

Don Stevens, Education Director, Michigan C.I.O. Council, Grand Rapids

Robert L. Taylor, Secretary-Treasurer, State Mutual Cyclone Insurance Company, Lapeer

Don Vander Werp, former State Senator, Fremont

James M. VerMeulen, President, American Seating Company, Grand Rapids

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

FOREWORD

An institution of higher education may properly be defined as a group of scholars associated for the purposes of learning, teaching, and advancing knowledge. The very heart of a college or university is thus the faculty, whose activities in teaching and research are the sole reason for the existence of the institution. It is, therefore, important, in a comprehensive survey of higher education in a State such as Michigan, to make a careful study and analysis of the characteristics of the faculty members who serve in the colleges and universities in the State. The purpose of Staff Study No. 10 is to report the findings of such an investigation.

An earlier report in the Survey Series, Staff Study No. 6, Instructional Programs in Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, dealt with the teaching loads and the instructional productivity of the faculties. That Staff Study also used data on faculty salaries for the purpose of computing instructional salary costs in the various institutions, at the three different instructional levels and in all the subject-areas in which courses were given. The present report, Staff Study No. 10, does not treat the problems of teaching load and instructional productivity, and it deals with faculty salaries from the point of view of the amounts paid the individual faculty members rather than with respect to the cost of producing a student-hour of credit.

The earlier report, Staff Study No. 6, included data from all the State-controlled institutions and all the community colleges in Michigan, but from only thirteen of the privately controlled institutions. Participation by the privately controlled institutions in that study was on a voluntary basis. The present report, Staff Study

No. 10, includes not only all the publicly controlled institutions but also practically all the privately controlled institutions in Michigan. The effort to get complete coverage of all the institutions of higher education in the State was very successful, for all but a very few of the privately controlled institutions submitted data. The ones that did not participate were mostly very small, specialized schools. The statistics reported in Staff Study No. 10 come from institutions enrolling 99.3 per cent of all the students attending college in Michigan. In the case of three privately controlled institutions that participated in the study, there was administrative reluctance to provide data on faculty salaries, so statistics on salaries at these three institutions are omitted from the chapter on that subject.

The Survey Staff wishes to express its deep appreciation for the excellent cooperation received from the Michigan institutions of higher education in providing data for the study of faculties. The compilation of the original data in the individual colleges and universities imposed no small burden on the institutional officials, for a full page of information was required for each faculty member. Some of the institutions, in which records on faculty members were not available or incomplete, were able to report by having each person on the faculty fill out the data form for himself. A few of the institutions, after compiling the data requested, have seen the value of a complete personnel record system for faculty members and have taken steps to install such a system, so that complete and accurate information on a continuing basis hereafter may be available to the administrative officials of the institution.

As in other Staff Studies in the Survey Series, there was agreement with the privately controlled institutions that they would not be identified by name in the published report. In accordance with this agreement the tabulations in Staff Study No. 10 identify the privately controlled institutions only by a code number. The responsible official in each case has been informed of the code number used to designate his institution.

In the early stages of the planning for the study of institutional faculties, the Survey Staff consulted with representatives of various colleges and universities in Michigan, with particular reference to the sorts of data that would be most readily available. Some items on which information would have been desirable were eliminated from the preliminary plans, on the advice of these institutional representatives that the data would be very difficult for the institutions to provide.

Suggestion was also made that the study should deal intensively with the quality of the faculties serving in the Michigan institutions. It is recognized that "quality" is a characteristic that is very difficult to define in objective terms. After a consideration of various proposals, and bearing in mind particularly the difficulties the institutions would encounter in collecting and reporting data, the Survey Staff decided to limit the investigation to those factors which can be reported objectively. It is recognized that such factors as degrees held, academic rank, length of service, and salaries reflect "quality" only indirectly. Such characteristics are of limited value for judging the quality of an individual faculty member. For groups of faculty members, however, research has shown such characteristics to have some relationship to general institutional quality. No other approach to the evaluation of the quality of institutional faculties is at present available for use in a comprehensive survey of a State's facilities for higher education. The data are presented in Staff Study No. 10 with the warning that they must be used cautiously, especially if an attempt is made to interpret the statistics in terms of the general quality of the faculties of the individual institutions.

The author of Staff Study No. 10, Dr. John X. Jamrich, is serving as Assistant Director of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan, while on leave of absence from his position as Dean of the College at Doane College, Crete, Nebraska. Dr. Jamrich has been completely responsible for the planning of this study, for the collection and processing of the data, and for the writing of the report. As in the case of the other Staff Studies in the Survey Series, the author takes full responsibility for the findings and recommendations and the full text of the report. It has been prepared for the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education and for the Citizens Advisory Committee, but this does not imply any endorsement by the Committees of the findings and recommendations. The publication of this report is in accordance with the general arrangements for the Survey, which provide that the Director shall have full authority to decide what shall be published as Staff Studies and as his report to the Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education.

The findings of Staff Study No. 10 indicate that the people of Michigan can take much pride in the general quality of the faculties serving the institutions of higher education in the State. The data of the study reflect the remarkable expansion that has had to occur in the instructional services of the institutions, because of increasing enrollments, for half the members of the faculties in service in the fall of 1957 had been in their present institutions for less than four years. Perhaps the outstanding finding of the entire study is the great need for improvement in faculty salaries. Unless funds can be provided rather promptly for marked increases in the salaries paid faculty members, it is doubtful that the institutions will be able to continue to maintain the same quality of service they have provided in the past.

Staff Study No. 10 is presented with the hope that it will be of service to the institutional officials and all the citizens of Michigan as they plan and provide for the future development of higher education in the State.

John Dale Russell
Director of the Survey

June 1958

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword (by the Director of the Survey). v

List of Tables. xii

CHAPTER

I. PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE STUDY 1

Kinds of Data Collected. 5

Participants in the Study. 8

II. AGE, SEX, AND INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE OF FACULTY MEMBERS. 10

Average Age. 10

Age Distribution 16

Sex Distribution 18

Age and Sex Distribution 23

Age, Sex, and Subject-area Taught. 24

Years of Service at Present Institution. 32

Where Instructional Service Was Performed. 38

III. ACADEMIC RANK 42

Rank and Age 46

Rank and Sex 49

Rank, Sex, and Subject-area Taught 51

Rank and Years of Service at Present Institution 66

IV. ACADEMIC DEGREES HELD 69

Highest Degree Earned. 69

Highest Degree Earned and Academic Rank. 75

Highest Degree Earned and Years of Service 78

Source of Highest Degree Earned. 83

Academic Rank and Source of Highest Degree Earned. 88

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER Page

V. LEVEL OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE. 91

Level of Instructional Service and Highest Degree Earned . . 94

Highest Degree, Teaching Level, and Subject-area 96

Teaching Level and Academic Rank 96

Teaching Level and Years of Service at Present Institution . 142

VI. SALARIES PAID TO FACULTY MEMBERS. 146

Salary Basis 146

Average Salaries 152

Salary Distributions 160

Salary and Academic Rank 162

Salaries and Sex of Faculty Members. 170

Average Salary by Highest Degree Earned. 175

Salary, Highest Degree, and Subject-area Taught. 177

Average Salaries by Level of Instruction 184

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 191

Appendix A - Form Used in Collecting Data. 201

Appendix B - Classification of Academic Degrees in This Study 204

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

1. Average Age and Standard Deviation of the Ages of Faculty Members at the Three Types of Institutions, Fall 1957. . . . 11

2. Average Age and Standard Deviation of the Age Distribution of Faculty Members in Each of the State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957. 13

3. Average Age and Standard Deviation of the Age Distribution of Faculty Members in Each of the Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957. 14

4. Average Age and Standard Deviation of the Age Distribution of Faculty Members in Each of the Community Colleges, Fall 1957. 15

5. Age Distribution of Faculty Members in the Institutions of Higher Education of Each Type in Michigan, Fall 1957 17

6. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members by Sex in the Three Types of Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1957. 18

7. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members of Each Sex in Each of the State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 20

8. Percentage of Faculty Members of Each Sex in Each of the Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 21

9. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members of Each Sex in Each of the Community Colleges, Fall 1957. 22

10. Average Age of Faculty Members of Each Sex in Each of the Three Types of Michigan Institutions, Fall 1957. 23

11. Average Age of Faculty Members, by Sex, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall, 1957 25

12. Average Age of Faculty Members, by Sex, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall, 1957 28

13. Average Age of Faculty Members, by Sex, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of Community Colleges, Fall 1957. 30

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE		Page
14.	Distribution of Faculty Members by Years of Previous Service at Each of the Three Types of Michigan Institutions, Fall 1957.	33
15.	Average Years of Service by Faculty Members at Institution of Present Employment in Each of the State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.	35
16.	Average Years of Service by Faculty Members at Institution of Present Employment in Each of the Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.	36
17.	Average Years of Service by Faculty Members at Institution of Present Employment in Each of the Community Colleges, Fall 1957.	37
18.	Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each State-controlled Institution Serving at Main or Extension Campuses of the Institution.	39
19.	Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Privately Controlled Institution Serving at Main or Extension Campuses of the Institution.	40
20.	Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Academic Rank in Each of the State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.	43
21.	Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Academic Rank in Each of the Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957	44
22.	Distribution of Faculty Members by Rank and Age in the Group of State-controlled Institutions of Michigan, Fall 1957.	47
23.	Distribution of Faculty Members by Rank and Age in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions of Michigan, Fall 1957.	48
24.	Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Academic Rank for Each Sex in the State-controlled and Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.	50
25.	Percentage of Faculty Members in the Four Academic Ranks (excluding "Other") for Each Sex in the State-controlled and Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957	50

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE Page

26. Percentage of All Faculty Members Holding Each Rank, for Each Subject-area, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957. 52

27. Percentage of All Faculty Members Holding Each Rank, for Each Subject-area, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957. 61

28. Distribution of Faculty Members by Years of Service at Present Institution and Academic Rank in the Group of State-controlled Institutions. 67

29. Distribution of Faculty Members by Years of Service at Present Institution and Academic Rank in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions. 68

30. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned, in Each of the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan, Fall 1957. 70

31. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned, in the Accredited and Unaccredited Privately Controlled Institutions in Michigan, Fall 1957 . . 71

32. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each State-controlled Institution Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned. 72

33. Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Privately Controlled Institution Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned . . . 73

34. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Community College Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned 74

35. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members of Each Academic Rank Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions of Michigan 76

36. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members of Each Academic Rank Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions in Michigan . . . 77

37. Distribution of Faculty Members by Highest Degree Earned and Years of Service at Present Institution in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957. 79

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE Page

38. Distribution of Faculty Members by Highest Degree Earned and Years of Service at Present Institution in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957. 80

39. Distribution of Faculty Members by Highest Degree Earned and Years of Service at Present Institution in the Group of Community Colleges, Fall 1957 81

40. Sources of Highest Degree Earned for Faculty Members in Each State-controlled Institution. 84

41. Sources of Highest Degree Earned for Faculty Members in Each Privately Controlled Institution. 85

42. Sources of Highest Degree Earned for Faculty Members in Each Community College 86

43. Percentage of Faculty Members Holding Each Academic Rank, by Highest Degree Earned, and by Source of Highest Degree, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions. 89

44. Percentage of Faculty Members Holding Each Academic Rank, by Highest Degree Earned and by Source of Highest Degree, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions. 90

45. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each State-controlled Institution at Each Level of Instructional Service, Fall 1957 92

46. Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Privately Controlled Institution at Each Level of Instructional Service, Fall 1957. 93

47. Number and Percentage of the Faculty Members at Each Level of Teaching Service Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned for Each of the Three Types of Institutions, Fall 1957. 95

48. Number of Faculty Members Having Each Highest Degree Earned for Each Level of Instructional Service in Each Subject-area in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957. 97

49. Number of Faculty Members Having Each Highest Degree Earned for Each Level of Instructional Service in Each Subject-area in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957. 109

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE		Page
50.	Number of Faculty Members Having Each Highest Degree Earned, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of Community Colleges, Fall 1957.	116
51.	Number and Percentage of Faculty Members at Each Level of Teaching Service Holding Certain Academic Ranks, for the Groups of State-controlled and Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.	123
52.	Number of Faculty Members at Each Academic Rank and Level of Instructional Service, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.	124
53.	Number of Faculty Members at Each Academic Rank and Level of Instructional Service, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.	135
54.	Distribution of Faculty Members According to Years of Service and Level of Instruction, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.	143
55.	Distribution of Faculty Members According to Years of Service and Level of Instruction, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957	144
56.	Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each State-controlled Institution on Each Type of Salary Contract, Fall 1957.	148
57.	Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Privately Controlled Institution on Each Type of Salary Contract, Fall 1957	149
58.	Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Community College on Each Type of Salary Contract, Fall 1957	150
59.	Average Faculty Salary and the Standard Deviation of the Distribution of Salaries in Each State-controlled Institution, Fall 1957 (10-month Basis).	154
60.	Average Faculty Salary and the Standard Deviation of the Distribution of Salaries in Each Privately Controlled Institution, Fall 1957 (10-month Basis).	155
61.	Average Faculty Salary and the Standard Deviation of the Distribution of Salaries in Each Community College, Fall 1957 (10-month Basis)	156

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE Page

62. Distribution of Faculty Salaries in Each of the Three Types of Institutions, Fall 1957, 10-month Salary Basis. 161

63. Average Faculty Salary for Each Academic Rank in Each State-controlled Institution, Fall 1957, 10-month Salary Basis . . 163

64. Average Faculty Salary for Each Academic Rank in Each Privately Controlled Institution, Fall 1957, 10-month Salary Basis 164

65. Cumulative Percentage Distribution of Faculty Salaries for Each Academic Rank in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis). 168

66. Cumulative Percentate Distribution of Faculty Salaries for Each Academic Rank in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis). 169

67. Percentage of Faculty Ranks for Each Salary Level in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis). 171

68. Percentage of Faculty Ranks for Each Salary Level in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis). 172

69. Average Faculty Salaries by Academic Rank and Sex in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis Only). 173

70. Average Faculty Salaries by Academic Rank and Sex in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis Only) 174

71. Average Faculty Salaries for Each Sex in the Group of Community Colleges, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis Only) . 175

72. Average Faculty Salary (10-month Basis) by Highest Degree Earned, in Each of the Three Types of Institutions, Fall 1957. 176

73. Average Faculty Salaries (10-month Basis) by Highest Degree for Each Subject-area in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957. 178

74. Average Faculty Salaries (10-month Basis) by Highest Earned Degree for Each Subject-area in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 180

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE | Page

75. Average Faculty Salaries (10-month Basis) by Highest Earned Degree for Each Subject-area in the Group of Community Colleges, Fall 1957. 182

76. Average Salaries of Faculty for Each Level of Instruction by Subject-area, in Each of the Three Types of Institutions, Fall 1957. 184

77. Average Faculty Salaries for Each Level of Instruction, and for Each Subject-area, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Contract Basis). 185

78. Average Faculty Salaries for Each Level of Instruction, and for Each Subject-area, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Contract Basis). 188

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE STUDY

Institutions of higher education have, historically, been deeply concerned about the qualitative characteristics of their educational efforts. This concern has been manifest in diverse ways and areas. Thus, attention has always been given to the provision of physical plants, equipment, and library materials. Similarly, in the evaluation of institutional excellence, great signifiance is attached to the content and organization of the curriculum and to the standards for admission of students.

As important as the above mentioned factors are, ultimately the prestige and eminence of a college or university is determined by the quality of instruction, research, and scholarly productivity of its faculty. Such prestige and eminence is not a coincidental occurence in the growth and development of institutions of higher education. On the contrary, the attainment of institutional excellence is typically the result of deliberate planning and diligent effort of institutional boards of control, presidents, deans, and staff. It is planning and effort predicated on existing financial support by private donors, business, industry, and the State appropriating agencies for the attainment of these goals.

These are rather general statements which pertain to colleges and universities throughout the country. Such observations are, however, applicable to the institutions of higher education in Michigan. The citizens of the State of Michigan have been zealous and generous in their support of the qualitative aspirations of the colleges, public and private. The understanding and generosity of the people, by whom higher education in Michigan has been supported in the past, will have to be forthcoming in even greater proportions if Michigan is to retain its enviable position in the qualitative provisions of higher education for its young people.

Because the faculties in colleges and universities are crucial factors in determining institutional and State prestige in higher education, it is important to have readily available information and records regarding the educational and professional backgrounds of the faculty members. There are at least four reasons for the maintainance of such records. First, principles of effective personnel management dictate that complete information be available on faculty employees in each of the institutions. Second, such records, showing qualifications of faculty, serve as standards of reference for institutional comparison and evaluation. Third, such information reflects not only the characteristics of faculties in individual institutions, but permits the compilation of such information on a State-wide basis. Fourth, complete information of this sort is essential as a basis for determining the future needs in the college teaching profession to meet the critical staffing needs, particularly in the next two decades.

Ideally, faculty personnel data kept by individual institutions should include a complete summary of educational training, teaching experience, research, publications, community and institutional service, and a record of salary, promotions, and leaves of absence. In the actual process of this study, it was impractical, for a number of reasons, to attempt a summary on all of these details. Because of the complexity of such a detailed summary and, in some instances, lack of such information, the scope of this study was limited to such data as could be readily obtained and analyzed, even though this meant the omission of certain pertinent information.

Numerous research projects, during recent years, have focused attention upon future college and university instructional staff needs and practices. Publications by the National Education Association[1] have been concerned with institutional policies and practices regarding instructional staffs and the supply and demand for teachers in colleges and universities. The U. S. Office of Education[2] has recently published an analysis of faculty and staff salaries, fringe benefits, tuition and fees, and room and board charges in colleges and universities. The American Association of University Professors[3] prepares a biennial report on instructional salaries in selected colleges and universities.

There are two predominant conclusions which can be drawn from these research studies on the national basis:

1. The percentage of newly-employed faculty with the doctorate has been steadily decreasing during the past five years, while the percentage of newly-employed faculty with less than a master's degree has been increasing. Where in 1953, 40.5 per cent of new, full-time faculty held a doctorate, in 1956 this percentage had dropped to 23.5. What makes this a critical fact is that this is occurring as a result of a lower number of doctorates being graduated and by large numbers of these going into professions outside of college teaching. All of this, of course, in the midst of greater needs resulting from the rapidly increasing college enrollments.

---

[1] National Education Association, Teacher Supply and Demand in Colleges and Universities, 1957.

National Education Association, Research Bulletin, Vol. XXXII, No. 4, December 1954.

[2] U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Higher Education Planning and Management Data, 1957-58, Circular No. 517.

[3] American Association of University Professors, Bulletin, Volume 43, No. 4, Winter, 1957, pp. 655-67; Volume 44, No. 1A, Spring, 1958, pp. 237-69.

2. During the past twenty years, the income changes and relative economic status of the college teaching profession have fallen behind in a startling manner, in relation not only to the well-established professions of law, medicine, and dentistry, but also in relation to positions available in rapidly increasing numbers in business and government. Thus, when in 1939, these professions enjoyed comparable, average incomes, by 1957, the real income (using 1939 as 100) of physicans was 198, of dentists it was 154, of lawyers it was 134, of faculty in 5 selected, large State universities it was 109, and in 28 privately controlled institutions it was 92.[4] The two groups of institutions were selected because of unusually good salary progress and policies.

These two factors are cause for serious and profound concern regarding the welfare of higher education on the part of private donors, business and industry, the State Legislature, and every citizen. The prompt provision of adequate funds now is essential in order that the colleges and universities in Michigan and in every other State can maintain and improve the quality of higher education.

Because of the continued high percentage of graduates with the doctorate going into professions other than college teaching and the decrease in the actual number of doctorates produced by the Nation's universities, the competitive situation for highly qualified faculty is becoming such as to present more than minor financial demands on the institutions of the State, particularly if they intend to retain a high percentage of doctorates on their staffs.

There are, of course, two other possible solutions to this problem. One is to limit college attendance to approximately the present level; the other is to compromise, knowingly, the quality of the college and university programs by staffing them with smaller and smaller percentages of those with the doctorate degree. Neither of these two possibilities is consistent with our present-day social needs and levels of expectations.

---

[4] Ibid.

The resolution of the problem lies in a well-informed citizenry and Legislature, with a determination, desire, and willingness to support college and university education of the highest quality in Michigan.

It is with the conviction that a well-informed public and Legislature can make the soundest decisions regarding provisions for the needs of our colleges and universities that this study of instructional faculties was undertaken as part of the Michigan Survey of Higher Education.

Kinds of Data Collected

It is quite evident that a study of college and university faculties can become a highly detailed and complex undertaking, especially if one attempts to account for the myriad of educational and professional experiences of each faculty member. After considerable discussion, with institutional representatives, of the problem of the scope of the study and the kinds of data readily available in the various institutions, the decision was reached to focus attention on the following factors: (1) the educational background in terms of the highest degree earned and source of this degree; (2) years of service at the institution of present employment; (3) the principal subject-area and level of instructional service; (4) age and sex of faculty members; (5) academic rank; (6) salaries paid and basis of employment contracts; and (7) whether the teaching responsibility was on the main campus, in extension work, or both.

The data for this report were collected by means of a data schedule form (see Appendix A). This form asked for data on the items listed in the preceding paragraph. The data schedule did not ask for identification of faculty members by name, although a fairly large number of the institutions submitted data with individuals' names. The data regarding individual faculty members, however, have been retained as confidential in the Survey Office.

The responses for each faculty member were tabulated by IBM processes. As in previous Staff Studies, the privately controlled institutions participated on a voluntary basis, and, furthermore, the data for the faculties of privately controlled institutions are presented with code numbers identifying each institution. Three of the privately controlled institutions which reported data chose not to submit specific salary data of faculty members. All other reporting institutions submitted complete reports.

The subject-areas of principal instructional assignment were coded under 99 separate categories, following the general pattern used in Staff Study No. 6 of this Survey Series. In these categorizations, an effort was made, within the limits of the IBM card capacity, to account for most of the various subject and departmental classifications used in the Michigan colleges and universities. Thus, there is a separate category for psychology as well as one for the combination of psychology and education. Similarly, there is a separate category for mathematics and one for physics, but there is also a separate classification for physics and mathematics combined.

In addition to the usual four academic ranks -- professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor -- a fifth category was used to include lecturers, teaching fellows, unclassified, part-time staff, and other designations not included in the first four.

Information was requested on the age and sex of the faculty member as well as the years of service at the present institution of employment, and whether the faculty member was teaching on-campus, off-campus or both. An additional item of information regarding service was concerned with the primary level of instructional service, whether undergraduate only, undergraduate and graduate, or graduate only.

Information was also requested regarding the salary of the faculty member for the 1957-58 contract, and the basis of this contract, whether the 10-month academic year, 11- or 12-month year, or part-time.

The two final items on the data schedule were concerned with the highest degree earned by each faculty member and whether the degree was earned at the institution of present employment, at another Michigan institution, or at an institution outside of Michigan. Although it would have been desirable, no information was requested regarding other degrees held, the field of specialization, or the specific institution from which the degree was obtained.

The basis used in the classification of highest degree earned was similar to that used by the U. S. Office of Education in its annual summary of degrees conferred in colleges and universities in the United States. The three categories used were (1) Doctor of Philosophy or comparable degree; (2) master's degree or comparable second professional degree; (3) bachelor's or comparable first professional degree. According to this definition the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., and similar, first professional degrees would be included under the third category. A list of the most frequently occurring degrees and the classification of these degrees for the purposes of this study are to be found in Appendix B.

Although many of these factors appear to be concerned with quantitative information, it is, nevertheless, possible to draw certain qualitative conclusions regarding faculties in the institutions of Michigan. For example, probably the most important single factor which is considered in the procurement of competent faculty is the level of educational achievement which is most clearly evidenced, with some exceptions, by the level of the highest degree earned by that faculty member. Furthermore, the inter-relationships between rank and salary, rank and highest degree earned, salary and highest degree earned certainly reflect institutional procurement and promotion policies. It is recognized that institutions give consideration to many other qualifications such as previous experience, research productivity, and personal qualities of the individual. Data regarding these factors were not requested because they are difficult to report objectively and because of the realization that such a data schedule would have placed an even greater burden on the individual institutions that provided data for this study.

The Survey staff had the cooperative assistance and counsel of several institutional representatives in the course of the preparation of the information schedule. The final form, which was used in the collection of the data, was the result of lengthy discussion and consultation with these administrative officials. Their contribution to this study is herewith acknowledged.

Participants in the Study

The cooperation of institutions providing data for this study was most commendable. Responses totaled 7,450 completed forms for faculty in service in the fall of 1957 in 56 of the 62 institutions to whom the forms were mailed. The participating institutions enrolled 99.3 per cent of all students in Michigan institutions of higher education.

Data were not requested on faculty members whose full time is given to research or other non-teaching duties, instructors in military science, and faculty members in medical and dental schools, if their full-time duties were in those professional schools. Department heads were to be included, but deans were to be excluded unless they taught half-time or more. Faculty teaching extension courses were included if the courses they taught carried college credit. Information was requested on all other faculty members including teaching fellows, graduate assistants, and other part-time instructors as long as they were responsible for a class to the point of actually giving the grade to the students in that class.

Data were received for faculty in service at all ten State-controlled institutions, all 15 community colleges, and 31 privately controlled institutions. The privately controlled institutions participated in this study of faculties on a voluntary basis. Throughout the study they are identified by a code number which is known only to the individual institution.

The matter of participating in the study was discussed by the privately controlled institutions at one of the meetings of the Michigan Association of Church Related Colleges. The decision reached at this meeting was to encourage the member institutions to participate in the study, but the matter of supplying specific information, such as individual salary data, was to be left to the discretion of the individual institution. All but three of the privately controlled institutions that participated provided the study with complete salary data on their faculties. The support of the Michigan Association of Church Related Colleges is appreciated and acknowledged by the Survey Staff.

The data and analyses are presented in seven chapters dealing with (1) age, sex, and instructional service of faculty members, (2) academic rank, (3) academic degrees held, (4) level of instructional service, and (5) salaries paid to faculty members. Summaries are given for these factors and certain cross tabulations of them.

The author wishes to express his personal appreciation to the administrative staffs and faculties of the participating institutions for their cooperation in furnishing the data, to Dr. John Dale Russell, the Director of the Survey for his guidance and counsel in the preparation of the report, and to Mrs. Elaine Frank, Survey Office Manager, for her diligence in the preparation of the manuscript.

CHAPTER II

AGE, SEX, AND INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE OF FACULTY MEMBERS

The present chapter is concerned with factors of age, sex, and instructional service of faculty members in Michigan institutions of higher education. Data are presented first on the average ages of faculty members and the distribution of ages in each of the three types of institutions. Then, data are given showing the number and percentage of male and female faculty members in the three types of institutions and each of the individual institutions. Also presented are data comparing the ages of male and female faculty members in each of the subject-areas taught.

The two final sections of the chapter deal with years of service at the institution of present employment and whether the instructional service was on-campus or in off-campus programs.

Average Age

Age data were available on 7,408 faculty members in the 56 institutions. Table 1 presents a summary of the average ages for the entire group as well as for faculty in each of the three types of institutions. Also given is the standard deviation for these same groups.

A word of explanation, perhaps, is in order regarding the interpretation of the standard deviation. Simply stated, the standard deviation is a computed statistic, which is a measure of distance measured from the arithmetic mean or average, such that one standard deviation on either side of the mean will encompass approximately 68 per cent of the cases under discussion in a normal or near-normal distribution. For example, if the ages of a random group of people yield an arithmetic mean of 45.0 and a standard deviation of 10.0, this would mean that 68 per cent of the group were between the ages of 35.0 (45.0 - 10.) and 55.0 (45.0 + 10.0). Thus, the standard deviation is a measure of variability which, with the arithmetic mean or average, gives a much more accurate picture of the distribution of the variables under discussion. It would indicate, in the above example, whether the average age of 45.0 is a result of 1,000 people with ages grouped closely around the mean or spread out.

It is interesting to note from Table 1 that the average ages for faculty in each of the three types of institutions are practically identical, being 41.2 for the State-controlled institutions, 41.1 for the privately controlled institutions, and 41.1 for the community colleges, and 41.2 for the total group. The age homogeneity of college and university faculties in Michigan is further substantiated by the fact that the standard deviations are also very similar. To interpret the standard deviation in this situation, one can say that approximately 68 per cent of the faculty in State-controlled institutions are between

Table 1. Average Age and Standard Deviation of the Ages of Faculty Members at the Three Types of Institutions, Fall 1957.

Type of Institution	Average Age	Standard Deviation	Total Faculty
State-controlled	41.2	11.3	4,884
Privately Controlled	41.1	11.7	1,808
Community Colleges	41.1	11.0	716
Totals	41.2	11.2	7,408

the ages of 29.9 and 52.5; in the privately controlled institutions 68 per cent of the faculty are between the ages of 29.4 and 52.8; while in the community colleges 68 per cent of the faculty are between 30.1 and 52.1 years of age.

These results, an average age of 41.2 and over two-thirds of the faculty between 30.0 and 52.4 years of age, are not at all unusual or unexpected when one considers the kinds of requirements normally associated with college and university teaching. At the lower end of the scale there are the minimum educational requirements, while at the upper end of the scale one finds retirement provisions at 65 years of age in many institutions. From this point of view, the distribution is not entirely normal, mathematically speaking, because it is cut off more definitely at the lower end than at the upper, and the fact that recent, rapid expansion of faculties has been primarily in the lower age brackets.

Table 2, 3, and 4 present the average ages and the standard deviations of the ages for faculties in the individual institutions. For the State-controlled institutions, Table 2, seven of the individual averages exceed the average for these institutions as a group. The highest average-age faculty is at Central Michigan College with an average age of 44.6. Northern Michigan College is a close second with an average age of 44.4, although these two institutions differ in that Central Michigan College has a standard deviation of 10.1 as compared to a standard deviation of 12.0 at Northern Michigan College. This would indicate that even though the faculties at these two institutions have similar average ages, the ages of the faculty at Central Michigan College tend to be more heavily concentrated about this average than those at Northern Michigan College.

The faculty with the lowest average age is to be found at Michigan State University. It also exhibits as one of the smaller standard deviations. This fact probably is the result of deliberate institutional policy during the rapid expansion of the institution within the past decade.

Table 2. Average Age and Standard Deviation of the Age Distribution of Faculty Members in Each of the State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Institution	Average Age	Standard Deviation	Total Faculty Reported
Central Michigan College	44.6	10.1	223
Eastern Michigan College	42.5	11.8	296
Ferris Institute	41.9	10.1	125
Michigan College of Mining and Technology (Houghton)	41.0	12.4	162
Michigan College of Mining and Technology (Sault Branch)	43.6	10.7	33
Michigan State University	39.4	10.3	1,408
Northern Michigan College	44.4	12.0	71
University of Michigan	42.3	11.7	1,178
Wayne State University	40.4	10.9	1,092
Western Michigan University	43.8	11.3	296
Averages	41.2	11.3	4,884

Table 3. Average Age and Standard Deviation of the Age Distribution of Faculty Members in Each of the Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Institution	Average Age	Standard Deviation
P-62	52.1	8.4
P-1	48.9	13.0
P-48	48.9	13.4
P-10	48.0	8.3
P-50	47.7	15.0
P-40	47.3	8.4
P-57	47.1	10.4
P-41	45.9	10.8
P-5	45.6	14.3
P-43	45.8	10.1
P-27	45.4	11.1
P-56	44.7	10.6
P-59	44.6	12.8
P-2	44.5	10.4
P-36	43.7	12.1
P-18	43.6	9.9
P-3	43.3	11.9
P-11	43.1	13.7
P-52	42.1	11.9
P-31	41.8	8.1
P-39	41.3	11.1
P-54	41.1	4.4
P-19	40.7	13.2
P-61	40.7	8.7
P-21	40.0	11.7
P-42	39.0	8.2
P-60	38.7	11.5
P-34	38.4	8.6
P-12	38.2	10.0
P-16	37.7	12.0
P-38	36.6	10.1
All Institutions Combined	41.1	11.7

Table 4. Average Age and Standard Deviation of the Age Distribution of Faculty Members in Each of the Community Colleges, Fall 1957.

Institution	Average Age	Standard Deviation	Total Faculty Reported
Alpena Community College	38.7	12.3	21
Battle Creek Community College	41.2	11.9	13
Bay City Junior College	42.3	14.4	83
Benton Harbor Community College	44.0	9.5	21
Flint Junior College	37.9	10.5	174
Gogebic Community College	38.4	9.2	17
Grand Rapids Junior College	46.2	11.9	81
Henry Ford Community College	38.8	8.8	84
Highland Park Junior College	40.3	11.2	59
Jackson Junior College	41.3	10.2	46
Lansing Community College	41.7	11.8	11
Muskegon Community College	47.9	10.9	35
Northwestern Michigan College	40.2	11.4	22
Port Huron Junior College	43.7	12.3	30
South Macomb Community College	40.5	8.0	19
Averages	41.1	11.0	716

The average ages of faculty members in the privately controlled institutions, Table 3, vary from a low of 36.6, with a standard deviation of 10.1, to a high of 52.1, with a standard deviation of only 8.4.

In the community colleges (Table 4), the highest average ages are to be found at Muskegon Community College (47.9) and at Grand Rapids Junior College (46.2). The youngest faculty, in terms of average age, is to be found at Flint Junior College with 37.9 as an average.

Age Distribution

A somewhat different approach to the problem of faculty age is to be found in the summary of Table 5. From this table it is again evident that the faculties of the three types of institutions do not differ substantially when summarized as a distribution in age intervals. That is, 7.3 per cent of the faculty in State-controlled institutions are 60 years or older; 8.8 per cent of the faculty in the privately controlled institutions are 60 years or older; and 6.5 per cent of the faculty in the community colleges are 60 years or older. At the other end of the age scale, 15.3 per cent of the faculties in the State-controlled institutions are less than 30 years old; 16.6 per cent of the faculties in the privately controlled institutions are less than 30 years old, and 18.1 per cent of the faculty in the community colleges are less than 30 years old.

One can draw an important conclusion from this table regarding the number of new faculty members who will be needed in the colleges and universities during the next five, ten, and fifteen years to replace only those who will be retiring at 65. During the next 5 years, about 7 per cent of the present faculty members will be eligible to retire; during the next 10 years, 15 per cent of the faculty members will be eligible to retire, while within the next 15 years, the institutions

Table 5. Age Distribution of Faculty Members in the Institutions of Higher Education of Each Type in Michigan, Fall 1957.

Age	State-controlled		Privately Controlled		Community Colleges		Total	
	Number	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Cumulative Per Cent
Over 70	8	0.2	13	0.7	2	0.3	23	0.31
69	5	0.3	14	1.5	0	0.3	19	0.56
68	25	0.8	10	2.0	1	0.4	36	1.05
67	25	1.3	7	2.4	0	0.4	32	1.48
66	33	2.0	8	2.8	0	0.4	41	2.03
65	29	2.6	12	3.5	2	0.7	43	2.61
64	36	3.3	20	4.6	6	1.5	62	3.44
63	41	4.1	14	5.4	8	2.6	63	4.29
62	49	5.1	22	6.6	7	3.6	78	5.34
61	58	6.3	22	7.8	10	5.0	90	6.55
60	50	7.3	18	8.8	11	6.5	79	7.61
55-59	337	14.2	113	14.9	62	15.1	512	14.49
50-54	503	24.5	168	24.1	74	25.3	745	24.50
45-49	559	35.9	198	35.0	88	37.5	845	35.86
40-44	698	50.1	253	48.8	79	48.4	1,030	49.70
35-39	864	67.8	299	65.2	113	64.0	1,276	66.85
30-34	829	84.7	332	83.4	129	81.9	1,290	84.19
Under 30	751	100.0	304	100.0	131	100.0	1,186	100.00
Totals	4,890		1,827		723		7,440	

of higher education in Michigan will have to replace one-fourth (or almost 2,000) of the present faculty members due to retirement.

Sex Distribution

Data on sex distribution were available for 7,444 faculty members in the colleges and universities of Michigan. According to Table 6, 6,051 of these, or 81.3 per cent, were men and 1,393, or 18.7 per cent, were women. Of the faculty in the State-controlled institutions, 83.6 per cent were men and 16.4 per cent were women. In the privately controlled institutions, 77.9 per cent were men and 22.1 per cent were women, while in the community colleges, 74.1 per cent were men and 25.9 per cent were women. Thus, the State-controlled institutions employed 5.7 per cent more men, proportionately, than did the community colleges, while the percentage of male faculty employed in privately controlled institutions fell between that of the other two.

Table 6. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members by Sex in the Three Types of Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1957.

	Male		Female		Total
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
State-controlled	4,096	83.6	804	16.4	4,900
Privately Controlled	1,419	77.9	402	22.1	1,821
Community Colleges	536	74.1	187	25.9	723
Totals	6,051	81.3	1,393	18.7	7,444
673 Degree-granting institutions in 1954-55*	49,032	78.0	13,790	22.0	62,822

*National Education Association, Teacher Supply and Demand in Colleges and Universities, 1957, p.44.

For the individual State-controlled institutions, Table 7 shows that in six of the ten institutions the percentage of male faculty is lower than the average for the State-controlled institutions as a group. The highest percentage of male faculty members is found at Michigan College of Mining and Technology at Houghton which has 98.8 per cent of male faculty members. The University of Michigan, with 94.2 per cent is second highest. The lowest percentage of male faculty employed is to be found at Eastern Michigan College with 63.3 per cent. These differing percentages probably tend to reflect, to a great degree, the institutional programs, particularly at an institution like Eastern Michigan College and especially at Michigan College of Mining and Technology. That is, well qualified women for staffing teacher education programs are probably more readily available than for engineering and some of the sciences.

The percentage of men and women faculty in the privately controlled institutions, see Table 8, varies from several with 100 per cent male faculty to one with only 6.9 per cent male faculty members. Thirteen of the 31 reporting privately controlled institutions have a percentage of male faculty members greater than the 77.9 per cent for the institutions as a group.

In the community colleges, Table 9, the highest percentage of male faculty members is at Henry Ford Community College with 84.7 per cent. The lowest percentage of male faculty members is at Port Huron Junior College with 56.7 per cent. Seven of the 15 community colleges have a percentage of male faculty members greater than the percentage for the community colleges as a group.

A comparison of the percentages of men and women on institutional faculties in Michigan can be made with percentages of men and women on faculties of 673 degree-granting institutions in the United States. These data are for the year 1954-55 and were obtained from "Teacher Supply and Demand in Colleges and Universities," published

Table 7. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members of Each Sex in Each of the State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Institution	Male		Female		Total
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	
Central Michigan College	156	70.0	67	30.0	223
Eastern Michigan College	195	63.3	113	36.7	308
Ferris Institute	96	76.8	29	23.2	125
Michigan College of Mining and Technology (Houghton)	160	98.8	2	1.2	162
Michigan College of Mining and Technology (Sault Branch)	29	87.9	4	12.1	33
Michigan State University	1,207	85.7	201	14.3	1,408
Northern Michigan College	50	70.4	21	29.6	71
University of Michigan	1,110	94.2	68	5.8	1,178
Wayne State University	871	79.5	225	20.5	1,096
Western Michigan University	222	75.0	74	25.0	296
Totals	4,096	83.6	804	16.4	4,900

Table 8. Percentage of Faculty Members of Each Sex in Each of the Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Institution	Male	Female
	Per Cent	Per Cent
P-62	100.0	0.0
P-56	100.0	0.0
P-54	100.0	0.0
P-34	100.0	0.0
P-18	100.0	0.0
P-38	94.8	5.2
P-21	93.6	6.4
P-60	92.3	7.7
P-31	90.0	10.0
P-16	87.0	13.0
P-11	85.7	14.3
P-36	85.1	14.9
P-10	84.6	15.4
P-61	76.9	23.1
P-50	75.0	25.0
P-39	74.5	25.5
P-3	72.9	27.1
P-1	67.7	32.3
P-2	66.7	33.3
P-59	63.2	36.8
P-12	63.2	36.8
P-27	62.2	37.8
P-52	60.0	40.0
P-5	51.9	48.1
P-42	51.5	48.5
P-19	41.2	58.8
P-43	40.4	59.6
P-41	18.9	81.1
P-48	15.4	84.6
P-40	13.6	86.4
P-57	6.9	93.1
All Institutions Combined: Number	1,419	402
Per Cent	77.9	22.1

Table 9. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members of Each Sex in Each of the Community Colleges, Fall 1957.

Institution	Male		Female		Total
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	
Alpena Community College	14	66.7	7	33.3	21
Battle Creek Community College	11	84.6	2	15.4	13
Bay City Junior College	68	81.0	16	19.0	84
Benton Harbor Community College	17	73.9	6	26.1	23
Flint Junior College	132	75.9	42	24.1	174
Gogebic Community College	14	82.4	3	17.6	17
Grand Rapids Junior College	53	65.4	28	34.6	81
Henry Ford Community College	72	84.7	13	15.3	85
Highland Park Junior College	40	67.8	19	32.2	59
Jackson Junior College	37	75.5	12	24.5	49
Lansing Community College	9	81.8	2	18.2	11
Muskegon Community College	23	65.7	12	34.3	35
Northwestern Michigan College	16	72.7	6	27.3	22
Port Huron Junior College	17	56.7	13	43.3	30
South Macomb Community College	13	68.4	6	31.6	19
Totals	536	74.1	187	25.9	723

by the National Education Association. On the basis of these data, it is evident that the State-controlled institutions have a somewhat higher percentage of men on their faculties than the total group of 673 institutions. The community colleges have a somewhat lower percentage, while the privately controlled institutions have almost an identical percentage of men and women that these 673 degree-granting institutions have.

Age and Sex Distribution

An analysis was made of the average ages of men and women faculty members in the three types of institutions and by subject-area in which the faculty member has his principal teaching assignment. Table 10 summarizes the data relating age and sex of institutional faculties by type of institutional control.

Table 10. Average Age of Faculty Members of Each Sex in Each of the Three Types of Michigan Institutions, Fall 1957.

Type of Institution	Men		Women		Total	
	Average Age	Standard Deviation	Average Age	Standard Deviation	Average Age	Standard Deviation
State-controlled	40.6	11.1	43.7	12.2	41.1	11.4
Privately Controlled	39.7	11.7	44.6	13.1	40.8	12.1
Community Colleges	39.4	11.5	44.4	12.0	40.7	11.7
Totals	40.3	11.2	44.1	12.3	41.2	10.8

In the State-controlled institutions the average age of women faculty members is 3 years higher than for the men. The average age of the women is 43.7 and of the men it is 40.6. The average age of women faculty members in the privately controlled institutions is 44.6 and that of the men is 39.7. The average ages of men and women faculty members in the community colleges are almost identical with those in the privately controlled institutions. The data of the table indicate that for the State as a whole, women faculty members are almost 4 years older than men faculty members, a statistically significant difference; the male faculty members in the State-controlled institutions, on the average, are slightly older than the male faculty members in the privately controlled institutions and the community colleges, and the women faculty members in the State-controlled institutions are younger than those in the privately controlled institutions and the community colleges. The larger standard deviations of the age-distribution of women faculty would indicate a greater variability of their ages than those of male faculty members.

Age, Sex, and Subject-area Taught

The average age of faculty members by sex for each subject-area of teaching assignment is given in Tables 11, 12, and 13. It is particularly interesting to note the areas in which unusually low or high average ages occur. Thus, in the State-controlled institutions one finds averages of 37.0 in anatomy, 37.7 in art and design, 36.4 in aeronautical engineering, 37.4 in electrical engineering, 37.9 in mathematics, 37.2 in physics, and 37.1 in psychology. Rather high average ages are to be found in classics -- 48.0, metallurgical engineering -- 45.9, mining engineering -- 49.9, naval and marine engineering -- 45.6, geology -- 46.0, German -- 45.0, history -- 44.8, nursing -- 47.5, and social work -- 47.2.

It was pointed out that the average age of women faculty members in State-controlled institutions is somewhat higher than the average age of male faculty members. This analysis by subject-area identifies those areas in which the

Table 11. Average Age of Faculty Members, by Sex, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Subject-area	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*
Agriculture	43.1	10.8	44.0		43.1	10.8
Anatomy	37.0		43.5		38.4	
Anthropology	43.3				43.3	
Architecture	42.7	11.2	45.0		42.7	11.7
Art and Design	37.7	9.8	50.4		40.9	11.7
Astronomy	43.0		59.0		45.3	
Bacteriology	56.0				56.0	
Biology	40.6	11.5	50.1		43.2	11.4
Biological Science	42.1		52.2		45.5	11.4
Botany	41.6	11.9	42.5		41.6	12.4
Business Administration	39.9	10.0	45.7	9.2	40.6	10.1
Chemistry	39.9	12.5	33.9		39.4	12.8
Chemistry & Chem. Engr.	47.7				47.7	
Classics	48.0		54.3		49.5	
Communication Skills	41.8	8.3	44.1		42.1	8.7
Economics	39.5	10.9	44.5		39.7	11.1
Education	41.8	9.7	45.4	9.3	42.8	9.9
Engineering, All types	40.2	17.6			40.2	17.6
Aeronautical	36.4	9.0			36.4	9.0
Chemical	40.6	11.9			40.6	11.9
Civil and Sanitary	42.4	11.8			42.4	11.8
Electrical	37.4	11.3			37.4	11.3
General	47.0	13.8			47.0	13.8
Geological	46.1				46.1	
Industrial	42.7				42.7	
Mechanical	40.1	11.0			40.1	11.0
Eng. Mechanics	36.5	12.0			36.5	12.0
Metallurgical	45.9				45.9	
Mining	49.9				49.9	
Naval and Marine	45.6				45.6	
English	40.2	11.1	43.8	14.2	40.7	11.4
English and Speech	39.5	12.6	44.7		40.9	12.9
Entomology	42.8				42.8	
Evaluation Services	40.0				40.0	
Field Services	44.0		56.0		48.0	
Fine Arts	41.9		39.3		41.4	
Foreign Studies	39.5		52.5		40.9	
Forestry & Nat. Res.	43.6	8.9			43.6	8.9
French	41.2		40.2		40.9	
General Education	37.6		47.0		39.9	

Table 11 (Continued)

Subject-area	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*
Geography	40.7	11.2	37.7		40.5	11.5
Geology	46.0	11.7	40.5		45.7	11.7
German	45.0	13.4	32.0		44.5	13.5
History	44.8	12.6	57.3		45.7	12.7
Home Economics			44.0	12.6	44.0	12.6
Hotel Administration	41.7		46.0		42.3	
Humanities	40.9	7.8			40.9	7.8
Industrial Arts	43.0	10.3			43.0	10.3
Industrial Technology	38.8	8.8	47.5		39.1	9.0
Journalism	43.5	9.5	43.0		43.5	9.3
Laboratory Schools	33.6	14.6	40.6	15.3	37.4	15.3
Language, Modern & Foreign	44.0	12.0	44.1		44.0	12.3
Law	42.5	12.8			42.5	12.8
Library Science	44.1		52.7		47.9	
Mathematics & Statistics	37.9	11.0	44.2	10.8	38.0	11.3
Medicine	45.1		60.0		46.3	
Mortuary Science	44.8				44.8	
Music	42.5	9.4	43.0	12.4	42.6	10.5
Natural Science	38.2	6.1	46.7		39.4	7.3
Nursing	47.5		39.1	11.1	39.4	11.2
Occupational Therapy	29.0		46.1		42.3	
Pharmacy	39.6	10.7	26.0		39.1	11.0
Philosophy	39.3	10.7	32.0		38.9	10.6
Physical Education	40.6	11.6	39.4	12.1	40.2	11.7
Physical Science	45.6		67.0		47.5	
Physics	37.2	11.8	45.7		37.4	11.8
Physics and Chemistry	49.8				49.8	
Police Administration	39.3				39.3	
Political Science	38.8	8.7	31.5		38.7	8.3
Psychology	37.1	10.1	39.0		37.3	10.0
Psychology & Education	42.7	9.4	51.1	9.1	46.1	10.0
Religion, Theology	41.5				41.5	
Slavic	39.4		38.5		39.2	
Social Sciences	42.8	11.6	40.5		42.6	11.6
Social Work	47.2		48.2		47.7	7.3
Sociology & Anthropology	38.2	8.4	38.0		38.2	8.2
Sociology	40.0	10.5	36.7		39.7	10.6
Spanish	42.8		37.5		42.1	
Speech and Drama	38.9	9.6	38.4		38.8	9.8
Unclassified, Grad. School	53.0				53.0	

Table 11 (Continued)

	Male		Female		Total	
Subject-area	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*
Veterinary Medicine	40.9	8.5			40.9	8.5
Zoology	41.2	10.9	38.3		41.0	11.2
Averages	40.6	11.1	43.7	12.2	41.1	11.4

* Arithmetic mean and standard deviation computed from ungrouped data. No standard deviations are computed when the number is less than 25.

Table 12. Average Age of Faculty Members, by Sex, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Subject-area	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*
Anthropology	39.0		44.0		42.3	
Architecture	48.0				48.0	
Art and Design	38.3		43.3		40.2	10.1
Biology	38.3	11.0	39.6		38.8	12.9
Biological Science	40.0				40.0	
Business Administration	40.1	11.2	42.8		40.4	11.2
Chemistry	38.0	12.9	44.1		38.9	13.2
Classics	48.2		48.5		48.3	
Economics	38.5	9.8	41.3		38.8	9.7
Education	46.8	11.9	46.5	13.5	46.7	12.6
Engineering, All types	39.0	11.0	37.0		39.0	10.9
Aeronautical	38.3				38.3	
Architectural	38.1		32.0		37.4	
Chemical	43.8				43.8	
Civil and Sanitary	38.6				38.6	
Electrical	40.5				40.5	
General	38.3	10.1			38.3	10.1
Industrial	39.0	8.6	42.0		39.1	8.5
Mechanical	33.7	7.5			33.7	7.5
Eng. Mechanics	43.7	10.7			43.7	10.7
English	38.3	10.0	45.2	10.1	40.2	10.3
Fine Arts	57.0				57.0	
French	37.0		60.4		50.7	
German	37.3		56.0		44.1	
Greek	32.0				32.0	
History	42.5	11.7	46.2		43.3	11.9
Home Economics			44.0		44.0	
Humanities	37.1		45.9		41.5	
Industrial Technology	36.6	9.8	33.5		36.5	9.7
Journalism	47.8		53.0		50.7	
Language, Modern & Foreign	43.9	10.3	48.4		45.3	10.2
Latin	41.6		51.2		46.0	
Law	42.9	10.5			42.9	10.5
Library Science			48.5		48.5	
Mathematics & Statistics	37.1	12.7	38.9		37.5	12.2

Table 12 (Continued)

Subject-area	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*
Music	40.5	14.0	44.0	13.5	42.0	13.8
Philosophy	41.2	11.3	55.2		43.4	12.0
Physical Education	35.2	7.6	42.0		38.0	10.2
Physics	41.8	13.2	24.0		41.2	13.6
Political Science	36.8		41.5		37.2	
Psychology	35.3	11.1	37.7		35.8	11.9
Psychology & Education	47.0				47.0	
Religion, Theology	47.3	10.3	46.0		47.1	10.4
Science & Mathematics	39.7	9.8	29.6		38.7	10.9
Social Sciences	40.0		63.0		41.9	
Social Work			42.8		42.8	
Sociology	40.6	8.5	47.0		42.2	9.6
Spanish	47.0		50.2		49.3	
Speech and Drama	36.9	12.8	44.0		39.1	13.0
Unclassified, Grad. School	32.8				32.8	
Averages	39.7	11.7	44.6	13.1	40.8	12.1

* Arithmetic mean and standard deviation computed from ungrouped data. No standard deviations are computed when the number is less than 25.

Table 13. Average Age of Faculty Members, by Sex, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of Community Colleges, Fall 1957.

	Male		Female		Total	
Subject-area	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*
Agriculture	48.0				48.0	
Anatomy			37.0		37.0	
Art and Design	31.6		45.7		35.6	
Biology	41.0		55.0		43.0	
Biological Science	32.2		48.5		37.7	
Botany			44.0		44.0	
Business Administration	41.1	9.7	43.0	11.5	41.8	10.6
Chemistry	48.2		43.0		47.4	10.8
Communication Skills	33.0				33.0	
Economics	43.8				43.8	
Education	51.0		47.3		48.2	
Engineering, All types	40.2	15.6			40.2	15.6
Electrical	47.5				47.5	
General	38.9	15.8			38.9	15.8
Mechanical	54.0				54.0	
Metallurgical	47.0				47.0	
English	37.7	10.0	46.4	12.0	41.4	11.4
French	55.0		45.8		47.6	
Geography	42.2		52.0		43.8	
Geology	40.0				40.0	
German	47.5		49.5		48.5	
History	39.6		47.8		41.5	
Home Economics			38.7		38.7	
Humanities	40.0				40.0	
Industrial Arts	41.8				41.8	
Industrial Technology	38.7	14.7			38.7	14.7
Journalism	36.0				36.0	
Language, Modern & Foreign	48.0		48.3		48.2	
Library Science			33.0		33.0	
Mathematics & Physics	40.0				40.0	
Mathematics & Statistics	38.7	9.4	49.6		40.5	10.0
Music	37.6		51.5		39.5	
Natural Science	50.0		55.0		52.5	
Nursing			38.0		38.0	
Philosophy	31.5				31.5	
Physical Education	34.4		33.1		34.0	10.0

Table 13 (Continued)

Subject-area	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*	Mean	Standard Deviation*
Physical Science	39.3				39.3	
Physics	47.8				47.8	
Physics & Chemistry	57.0				57.0	
Political Science	36.9		53.0		38.4	
Psychology	42.1		51.7		45.0	
Psychology & Education	41.0				41.0	
Science and Mathematics	36.6	9.7	44.0		37.6	10.0
Social Sciences	40.3	11.1	38.5		40.0	11.1
Sociology	40.7		45.5		42.6	
Spanish	38.0		57.0		44.3	
Speech and Drama	38.8		49.0		40.8	
Zoology	39.2				39.2	
Averages	39.4	11.5	44.4	12.0	40.7	11.7

* Arithmetic mean and standard deviation computed from ungrouped data. No standard deviations are computed when the number is less than 25.

average ages of the women are particularly high, namely in art and design -- 50.4, biology -- 50.1, biological sciences -- 52.2, classics -- 54.3, history -- 57.3, library science -- 52.7, and psychology and education -- 51.1. Similar instances of relatively high average ages in certain subject-areas are to be found in the privately controlled institutions and the community colleges.

Years of Service at Present Institution

Although data on total years of service in college teaching would have been very desirable, such data were not compiled. It was decided to ask only for the years of service, by the faculty member, at the institution of present employment prior to the beginning of the fall term of 1957. Thus, a faculty member who had been on the staff of the institution for four years prior to the fall of 1957 would be recorded as having been there four years. If he had been there for one semester, he would have been recorded as having zero years of service.

Table 14 presents the data on years of previous service at the institution of present employment for faculty members at the three types of institutions in Michigan, with cumulative percentages for each type and for the total. The percentages in the total column indicate that 50.3 per cent of the faculty members now in service at the several institutions have been there for less than four years; 44.4 per cent of them have been there for less than three years; while 14.5 per cent have been at their respective institutions ten years or longer. When one considers the very rapid enrollment increases during the past several years in these institutions, it is not difficult to understand why the years of service are as low as they are. This rapid influx of new faculty, of course, creates certain problems for the individual institutions, especially in the area

Table 14. Distribution of Faculty Members by Years of Previous Service at Each of the Three Types of Michigan Institutions, Fall 1957.

Years of Previous Service at This Institution	State-controlled		Privately Controlled		Community Colleges		Total	
	Number	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Cumulative Per Cent
0	943	19.2	234	12.8	199	27.5	1,376	18.5
1	683	33.2	370	33.1	131	45.6	1,184	34.4
2	481	43.0	181	43.0	87	57.7	749	44.4
3	256	48.2	124	49.8	61	66.1	441	50.3
4	225	52.8	119	56.3	24	69.4	368	55.3
5	170	56.3	90	61.2	24	72.8	284	59.1
6-7	272	61.8	125	68.0	29	76.8	426	64.8
8-9	379	69.6	123	74.8	19	79.4	521	71.8
10-14	711	84.1	222	86.9	88	91.6	1,021	85.5
15-19	230	88.8	89	91.8	25	95.0	344	90.1
20-24	152	91.9	46	94.3	10	96.4	208	92.9
25-29	184	95.6	49	97.0	10	97.8	243	96.2
30-34	127	98.2	40	99.2	15	99.9	182	98.6
35 & over	87	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	103	100.0
Totals	4,900		1,827		723		7,450	

of orienting these faculty to institutional procedures and traditions. To bring these new staff people into the "institutional community" calls for vital and vigorous administration.

Of the three types of institutions, the community colleges have by far the largest percentages of recent faculty appointments. In these colleges 57.7 per cent of the staff has had less than 3 years of service, and 27.5 per cent of the faculties were in their first full year of service in the fall of 1957. This situation again reflects the very rapid enrollment increases in these institutions. There is, certainly, need in the community colleges to implement promotion, retirement and tenure policies in these institutions, as these larger and larger enrollments come to their doors.

The State-controlled and privately controlled institutions do not differ substantially in the distribution of years of service of their faculties, except that the State-controlled group reflects, in the 19.2 per cent with less than one year's service, the higher percentage of enrollment increases at these institutions this past year, necessitating the hiring of a larger number of new faculty members. The other difference which may be noted is that the median for the three types of institutions are 2, 3, and 4 years respectively for the State-controlled institutions, privately controlled institutions, and community colleges.

The average years of service at the institution of present employment for the faculties in the individual institutions of the State are shown in Tables 15, 16, and 17. For the State-controlled institutions the average for the group is 7.5. Two of the institutions, the University of Michigan and Western Michigan University, with 9.3 and 9.2 average years of service, are well above the average for the group. Wayne State University and Michigan State University, with averages

Table 15. Average Years of Service by Faculty Members at Institution of Present Employment in Each of the State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Institution	Average Years of Service at Institution	Total Faculty Reported
Central Michigan College	8.1	223
Eastern Michigan College	7.3	296
Ferris Institute	3.3	125
Michigan College of Mining and Technology (Houghton)	8.6	162
Michigan College of Mining and Technology (Sault Branch)	5.6	33
Michigan State University	6.4	1,408
Northern Michigan College	8.9	71
University of Michigan	9.3	1,178
Wayne State University	6.7	1,092
Western Michigan University	9.2	296
Averages	7.5	4,884

Table 16. Average Years of Service by Faculty Members at Institution of Present Employment in Each of the Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Institution	Average Years of Service at Institution
P-56	14.1
P-62	13.0
P-48	12.4
P-19	12.2
P-36	11.0
P-57	10.3
P-27	9.5
P-41	9.4
P-2	9.2
P-11	8.8
P-54	8.4
P-18	8.3
P-31	7.8
P-39	7.2
P-1	7.0
P-61	6.7
P-10	6.7
P-34	6.6
P-5	6.3
P-50	5.9
P-60	5.7
P-59	5.5
P-3	5.4
P-42	5.2
P-16	5.2
P-21	5.1
P-43	5.0
P-52	4.3
P-40	4.3
P-38	3.4
P-12	1.9
Group Average	6.6

Table 17. Average Years of Service by Faculty Members at Institution of Present Employment in Each of the Community Colleges, Fall 1957.

Institution	Average Years of Service at Institution	Total Faculty Reported
Alpena Community College	2.1	21
Battle Creek Community College*	0.6	13
Bay City Junior College	5.8	83
Benton Harbor Community College	4.7	21
Flint Junior College	2.4	174
Gogebic Community College	3.3	17
Grand Rapids Junior College	8.0	81
Henry Ford Community College	3.9	84
Highland Park Junior College	7.7	59
Jackson Junior College	6.3	46
Lansing Community College**	0.0	11
Muskegon Community College	8.0	35
Northwestern Michigan College	3.6	22
Port Huron Junior College	6.6	30
South Macomb Community College	2.8	19
Averages	4.8	716

* Second year of operation.

**First year of operation.

of 6.7 and 6.2, reflect, probably, more than anything else, their rapid expansion during the last several years. This is also evident at Ferris Institute, with an average years of service of its faculty members of only 3.3 years.

The community colleges, as a group have a relatively low average years of service with 4.8. There are several of these institutions, however, such as Grand Rapids Junior College, Highland Park Junior College, and Muskegon Community College which show a faculty with an average well above that of the group.

The privately controlled institutions, with a group average of 6.6 years, show considerable variability on the average years of service of their faculties.

Where Instructional Service Was Performed

In several of the colleges and universities in Michigan, faculty members are assigned teaching duties in institutional programs organized in branches located off the main campus. In some of the institutions, certain faculty hold appointments which call for instructional service entirely in such branches of the institution. For this study, information was gathered on the question whether the instructional service of the faculty member was entirely on the main campus, entirely at an off-campus branch, or at both of these. The Sault Ste. Marie Branch of Michigan College of Mining and Technology is treated as a separate institution. Tables 18 and 19 summarize the data for the individual institutions, giving the number and percentage of each institution's faculty engaged in service under one of the three arrangements.

For the State-controlled institutions, which conduct the major portion of extension course work in the State, 7.4 per cent of the faculty are involved in teaching on-campus and off-campus, 2.3 per cent are involved in teaching just

Table 18. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each State-controlled Institution Serving at Main or Extension Campuses of the Institution.

Institution	Service					
	On-campus Only		Off-campus Only		Both On and Off-campus	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Central Michigan College	169	77.2	2	0.9	48	21.9
Eastern Michigan College	252	82.6	0	0.0	53	17.4
Ferris Institute	125	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Michigan College of Mining & Tech. (H)	162	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Michigan College of Mining & Tech. (S)	33	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Michigan State University	1,255	89.2	40	2.8	112	8.0
Northern Michigan College	71	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
University of Michigan	1,108	94.1	7	0.6	62	5.3
Wayne State University	940	86.2	61	5.6	89	8.2
Western Michigan University	296	100.0	0*	0.0	0*	0.0
Totals	4,411	90.3	110	2.3	364	7.4

*Western Michigan University reported no faculty members in these categories, although the institution does have a large program of extension teaching.

Table 19. Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Privately Controlled Institution Serving at Main or Extension Campuses of the Institution.

Institution	Per Cent of Faculty Serving:		
	On-campus Only	Off-campus Only	Both On and Off-campus
P-1	100.0		
P-2	100.0		
P-3	100.0		
P-5	98.1		1.9
P-10	100.0		
P-11	100.0		
P-12	100.0		
P-16	100.0		
P-18	100.0		
P-19	54.5	9.1	36.4
P-21	100.0		
P-27	97.8	2.2	
P-31	100.0		
P-34	100.0		
P-36	100.0		
P-38	100.0		
P-39	100.0		
P-40	100.0		
P-41	90.5	9.5	
P-42	100.0		
P-43	100.0		
P-48	100.0		
P-50	88.9	3.7	7.4
P-52	100.0		
P-54	100.0		
P-56	100.0		
P-57	100.0		
P-59	100.0		
P-60	91.4	7.5	1.1
P-61	100.0		
P-62	100.0		
Totals	96.3	2.6	1.1

off-campus courses, while 90.3 per cent of the faculty have responsibility for on-campus course work only. The privately controlled institutions conduct a much smaller scale operation in extension, with less than 4 per cent of their faculty involved in any such activity. Only one of the community colleges reported faculty assigned to off-campus teaching.

CHAPTER III

ACADEMIC RANK

A standard definition or uniform description of qualifications is not available for the academic ranks generally used in colleges and universities. Assignments of new faculty members to a particular rank or promotion from one rank to another are normally based upon the institution's estimate of the scholarly maturity of the faculty member. Although no formal investigation was made of practices in assigning the several academic ranks, stated policies appear to be in effect at all of the State-controlled institutions. None of the community colleges has the usual scheme of academic ranks used in degree-granting institutions, while in the majority of the privately controlled institutions, statements of qualifications for the various ranks are not as readily available, at least they were not received from a number of them in response to a request by the Survey office.

Tables 20 and 21 present the summaries, by individual institution, of academic rank distribution in Michigan colleges and universities in the fall of 1957. These tables give the number and percentage of faculty in each of the four, usual academic ranks -- professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor -- and group all other instructional staff -- lecturers, part-time, and teaching fellows -- under the heading of "Other."

In the State-controlled institutions the average percentage in each rank for the entire group of institutions is professor -- 19.0, associate professor -- 19.1, assistant professor -- 28.2, instructor -- 18.9, and "Other" -- 14.7. There are

Table 20. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Academic Rank in Each of the State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Institution	Academic Rank										Total No. of Faculty Members
	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Other		
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	
Central Michigan College	41	18.4	41	18.4	113	50.7	27	12.1	1	0.4	223
Eastern Michigan College	39	12.7	46	14.9	160	51.9	63	20.5	0	0.0	308
Ferris Institute	6	4.8	16	12.8	47	37.6	15	12.0	41	32.8	125
Mich. College of Mining & Tech. (Houghton)	33	20.4	38	23.5	45	27.8	31	19.1	15	9.2	162
Mich. College of Mining & Tech. (Sault Branch)	0	0.0	6	18.2	17	51.5	10	30.3	0	0.0	33
Michigan State University	229	16.3	276	19.6	417	29.6	357	25.4	129	9.2	1,408
Northern Michigan College	15	21.1	21	29.6	29	40.8	6	8.5	0	0.0	71
University of Michigan	381	32.3	242	20.5	240	20.4	254	21.6	61	5.2	1,178
Wayne State University	131	11.9	175	16.0	176	16.0	153	14.0	461	42.1	1,096
Western Michigan University	58	19.6	74	25.0	140	47.3	11	3.7	13	4.4	296
Totals	933	19.0	935	19.1	1,384	28.2	927	18.9	721	14.7	4,900
Totals*	933	22.3	935	22.4	1,384	33.1	927	22.2	-	-	4,179

* Excluding "Other" category.

Table 21. Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Academic Rank in Each of the Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Institution	Academic Rank				
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other
	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent
P-31	90.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
P-62	85.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0
P-54	64.7	23.5	0.0	5.9	5.9
P-36	44.6	19.2	19.2	17.0	0.0
P-3	41.7	6.2	41.7	8.3	2.1
P-57	34.5	24.1	10.4	24.1	6.9
P-48	26.9	30.8	15.4	23.1	3.8
P-1	25.8	25.8	19.4	29.0	0.0
P-50	25.0	3.6	46.4	25.0	0.0
P-27	24.4	35.6	11.1	24.4	4.5
P-41	24.3	14.9	21.6	36.5	2.7
P-16	22.0	10.0	16.0	34.0	18.0
P-42	21.2	27.3	33.3	18.2	0.0
P-52	20.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	0.0
P-39	19.6	23.5	33.3	11.8	11.8
P-2	19.0	21.4	29.8	26.2	3.6
P-18	19.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	81.0
P-43	17.0	21.3	25.5	21.3	14.9
P-60	11.8	7.3	16.7	19.6	44.6
P-38	6.9	5.2	20.7	67.2	0.0
P-5	5.8	26.9	21.1	40.4	5.8
P-56	5.6	55.5	27.7	5.6	5.6
P-21	5.5	8.2	33.6	52.7	0.0
P-59	5.3	5.3	5.3	84.1	0.0
P-34	4.3	21.0	51.4	23.3	0.0
P-10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
P-11	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7
P-40	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
P-61	0.0	53.8	46.2	0.0	0.0
P-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
P-12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Total	15.4	13.8	23.6	29.7	17.5
Total Excluding "Other"	18.7	16.7	28.6	36.0	-

several individual instances of deviations from these group averages. For example, the University of Michigan has 32.2 per cent of its staff with the rank of professor. This situation can be logically justified in light of that institution's predominant graduate program as was indicated in Staff Study No. 6 of the Michigan Survey of Higher Education. There is clear evidence that the University of Michigan has well defined and rigorous standards pertaining to promotion from one rank to another.

Unusually large percentages are noted in the rank of assistant professor at Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, Western Michigan University, and, to a lesser extent, Northern Michigan College. The 51.5 per cent in the rank of assistant professor and the absence of any use of the rank of professor at the Sault Ste. Marie Branch of Michigan College of Mining and Technology is, of course, related to the fact that this institution offers only the lower division work of the freshman and sophomore year, while the percentages at Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, and Western Michigan University, may be a result of numerically large appointments at these ranks in recent years to keep pace with rapid enrollment increases, and to keep within the available instructional budgets. Assuming that many of these assistant professors have, or will have, the qualifications for the upper ranks, and that the respective institutions will have available the financial resources, these institutions find themselves in a rather desirable position from the point of view of having promotions available for its staff. At the same time, when promotions occur, funds will be needed to pay the salaries appropriate to the ranks.

In the privately controlled institutions, the percentage in the respective ranks -- professor -- 15.4, associate professor -- 13.8, assistant professor -- 23.6, instructor -- 29.7, and "Other" -- 17.5, are somewhat different from the State-controlled institutions. A look at the distribution of ranks in the individual institutions reveals that there is considerable variation among them on this factor. For example, several institutions do not have the usual rank designation at all, while several others show very heavy concentrations in the upper ranks. Thus, in one institution, 64.7 per cent of the staff has the rank of full professor; in two others 41.7 per cent and 44.6 per cent are full professors. Although several of the privately controlled institutions exhibit distributions similar to the State-controlled institutions, a number of them, usually with relatively small faculties, have rather uneven patterns of academic rank distributions.

One word of caution should be given about the use of these data for comparative purposes with results of other summaries, regional or national. It should be noted that the percentage computations in this study were made using the total number of faculty reported, including part-time and graduate assistants. The differences which would result by omitting the "Other" category, can be seen at the bottom of Tables 1 and 2 where the percentages are given excluding the "Other" category.

Rank and Age

The relationship between age and academic rank is shown in Table 22 for the State-controlled institutions and in Table 23 for the privately controlled institutions. Because the usual academic rank designations are not used in the community colleges, no tabular summary is presented for them.

It may be concluded from both tables, especially Table 22, that there exists an almost direct relationship between academic rank and age of faculty members in the State-controlled institutions. Thus, faculty members younger than 40, holding

Table 22. Distribution of Faculty Members by Rank and Age in the Group of State-controlled Institutions of Michigan, Fall 1957.

Age Distribution	Number at Each Faculty Rank:					All Ranks Combined
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	
Over 70	3	2	0	0	3	8
69	2	3	0	0	0	5
68	20	3	1	0	1	25
67	15	6	3	0	1	25
66	23	7	2	1	0	33
65	19	4	2	1	3	29
64	18	6	9	0	3	36
63	24	5	7	1	4	41
62	23	10	11	1	4	49
61	27	14	13	1	3	58
60	25	13	8	0	4	50
55 - 59	157	82	58	12	28	337
50 - 54	188	131	105	23	56	503
45 - 49	165	153	132	39	70	559
40 - 44	152	220	192	53	81	698
35 - 39	52	197	360	147	108	864
30 - 34	19	71	351	283	105	829
Under 30	1	8	130	365	247	751
Totals	923	935	1,384	927	721	4,890

Table 23. Distribution of Faculty Members by Rank and Age in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions of Michigan, Fall 1957.

Age Distribution	Number at Each Faculty Rank:					All Ranks Combined
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	
Over 70	8	1	1	2	1	13
69	7	2	1	2	2	14
68	5	1	2	2	0	10
67	3	2	0	0	2	7
66	5	1	1	0	1	8
65	6	2	1	2	1	12
64	14	2	1	3	0	20
63	7	1	2	2	2	14
62	11	6	0	4	1	22
61	12	5	1	2	2	22
60	6	4	3	3	2	18
55 - 59	46	25	15	15	12	113
50 - 54	45	31	43	33	16	168
45 - 49	41	45	42	42	28	198
40 - 44	40	38	89	51	35	253
35 - 39	19	60	86	77	57	299
30 - 34	5	25	113	134	55	332
Under 30	1	2	33	167	101	304
Totals	281	253	434	541	318	1,827

the rank of professor, are in the distinct minority, the proportion being 72 out of the total of 4,890 faculty members, or 72 out of 2,444 of these who are less than 40 years old. Similarly, of the 696 faculty in the State-controlled institutions who are over 55 years old, only 17 hold the rank of instructor, but 356 are full professors. In Table 22, a line connecting the modal values under each rank is a straight line sloping down from left to right.

Similar conclusions can be drawn from Table 23, showing the academic rank-age relationship for the privately controlled institutions, except that the age interval with the largest number for the rank of professor is 60-65, ten years higher than in the State-controlled institutions. In these institutions, of the 935 faculty less than 40 years old, only 25 hold the rank of professor, a proportion similar to that in the State-controlled institutions. Of the 160 faculty over 60 years of age, 22 hold the rank of instructor, a percentage considerably higher than in the State-controlled institutions.

Rank and Sex

Tables 24 and 25 present data on academic rank and sex distribution in the State-controlled institutions in Michigan. Table 24 shows the percentage of men holding each of the ranks, the percentage of women holding each rank, and the percentage of men and women holding each rank. Table 25 gives the percentages excluding the "Other" category.

It is quite evident from Table 24 that at the State-controlled institutions the percentage of male faculty members holding each rank is similar to the percentage for the institutions as a group. It is, however, quite as evident, that the percentage of women holding the rank of full professor is just one-third the percentage for men. The percentage of women holding the rank of associate professor is also

Table 24. Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Academic Rank for Each Sex in the State-controlled and Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

State-controlled	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total Number of Faculty
Men	21.4	19.9	27.5	17.2	13.9	4,082
Women	7.3	15.1	32.3	27.4	17.9	793
Total	19.1	19.1	28.3	18.9	14.6	4,875
Privately Controlled						
Men	15.3	14.0	25.1	27.5	18.1	1,406
Women	16.2	14.2	20.3	37.7	11.6	395
Total	15.5	14.1	24.0	29.8	16.7	1,801

Table 25. Percentage of Faculty Members in the Four Academic Ranks (excluding "Other") for Each Sex in the State-controlled and Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

State-controlled	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total Number of Faculty
Men	24.9	23.1	32.0	20.0	3,513
Women	8.9	18.4	39.3	33.3	651
Total	22.4	22.4	33.1	22.1	4,164
Privately Controlled					
Men	18.7	17.1	30.6	33.6	1,152
Women	18.3	16.0	22.9	42.7	349
Total	18.6	16.9	28.8	35.7	1,501

lower than that for the men. Almost 60 per cent of the women are in the two ranks of assistant professor and instructor, while only 44 per cent of the men are in these ranks. Forty per cent of the men are in the professor and associate professor ranks, while only 22 per cent of the women are in these two upper ranks.

The situation is quite different in the group of privately controlled institutions. There the percentages of women holding the various ranks are very similar to those for the men, with a higher percentage of women than men being instructors. It would appear, on the basis of these tables, that possibilities for women to hold the two highest academic ranks are distinctly better in the privately controlled institutions than in the State-controlled institutions of Michigan. One must, of course, recognize the possibility that these differences may be reflective mainly of requirements for promotion based on research productivity and educational background of the faculty members. Again, no formal investigation was made of this particular problem, but it is interesting to note that for the University of Michigan, whose faculty consisted of 5.8 per cent women, the Bibliography of Publications (by members of the Several Faculties of the University of Michigan for 1951, 1952, and 1953) showed that less than 4 per cent of the 898 contributing faculty members were women staff members.

Rank, Sex, and Subject-area Taught

Table 26 gives the distribution of faculty members in the State-controlled institutions -- men, women, and total, according to rank and subject-area of principal teaching assignment. Thus, in geology, 43.9 per cent of the faculty are full professors, 19.5 per cent are associate professors, 19.5 per cent are assistant professors, 12.2 per cent are instructors, with 4.2 per cent "Other." This might be compared with home economics in which 12.0 per cent were professors,

Table 26. Percentage of All Faculty Members Holding Each Rank, for Each Subject-area, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Subject-area		Number of Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
Agriculture	Men	141	29.1	35.5	24.8	7.1	3.5
	Women	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	142	29.6	35.2	24.6	7.0	3.5
Anatomy	Men	7	28.6	14.3	14.3	14.3	28.6
	Women	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	9	33.3	11.1	22.2	11.1	22.2
Anthropology	Men	9	33.3	55.6	11.1	0.0	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	9	33.3	55.6	11.1	0.0	0.0
Architecture	Men	61	23.0	14.8	41.0	21.3	0.0
	Women	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
	Total	63	23.8	14.3	39.7	22.2	0.0
Art and Design	Men	53	9.4	18.9	39.6	13.2	18.9
	Women	18	11.1	27.8	38.9	16.7	5.6
	Total	71	9.9	21.1	39.4	14.1	15.5
Astronomy	Men	6	66.7	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0
	Women	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	7	57.1	28.6	14.3	0.0	0.0
Bacteriology	Men	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Biology	Men	38	23.7	13.2	44.7	18.4	0.0
	Women	14	21.4	21.4	35.7	14.3	7.1
	Total	52	23.1	15.4	42.3	17.3	1.9
Biological Science	Men	10	30.0	10.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	5	20.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0
	Total	15	26.7	6.7	46.7	13.3	6.7
Botany	Men	45	26.7	35.6	24.4	2.2	11.1
	Women	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
	Total	47	25.5	36.2	23.4	2.1	12.8
Business Administration	Men	256	18.4	21.9	21.9	17.6	20.3
	Women	35	2.9	20.0	37.1	22.9	17.1
	Total	291	16.5	21.6	23.7	18.2	19.9

Table 26 (Continued)

Subject-area		Number of Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
Chemistry	Men	118	2.2	22.0	27.1	11.0	18.6
	Women	11	9.1	0.0	27.3	27.3	36.4
	Total	129	20.2	20.2	27.1	12.4	20.2
Chemistry and Chemical Engineering	Men	14	35.7	14.3	50.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	14	35.7	14.3	50.0	0.0	0.0
Classics	Men	10	50.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	10.0
	Women	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Total	13	38.5	15.4	0.0	15.4	30.8
Communication Skills	Men	56	3.6	14.3	44.6	37.5	0.0
	Women	8	0.0	12.5	37.5	50.0	0.0
	Total	64	3.1	14.1	43.8	39.1	0.0
Economics	Men	90	21.1	15.6	26.7	20.0	16.7
	Women	4	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
	Total	94	20.2	14.9	27.7	21.3	16.0
Education	Men	320	20.0	15.6	23.8	12.5	28.1
	Women	132	8.3	15.9	18.9	22.0	34.8
	Total	452	16.6	15.7	22.3	15.3	30.1
Engineering, (All Types)	Men	535	24.3	21.5	18.7	21.5	14.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	535	24.3	21.5	18.7	21.5	14.0
Aeronautical Engineering	Men	29	24.1	27.6	24.1	10.3	13.8
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	29	24.1	27.6	24.1	10.3	13.8
Chemical Engineering	Men	57	40.4	15.8	19.3	14.0	10.5
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	57	40.4	15.8	19.3	14.0	10.5
Civil and Sanitary Engineering	Men	69	27.5	26.1	13.0	17.4	15.9
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	69	27.5	26.1	13.0	17.4	15.9
Electrical Engineering	Men	105	21.0	19.0	16.2	28.6	15.2
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	105	21.0	19.0	16.2	28.6	15.2

Table 26 (Continued)

Subject-area		Number of Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
General Engineering	Men	32	18.8	25.0	21.9	21.9	12.5
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	32	18.8	25.0	21.9	21.9	12.5
Geological Engineering	Men	7	57.1	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	7	57.1	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.0
Industrial Engineering	Men	14	7.1	28.6	14.3	7.1	42.9
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	14	7.1	28.6	14.3	7.1	42.9
Mechanical Engineering	Men	142	20.4	16.9	23.9	23.9	14.8
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	142	20.4	16.9	23.9	23.9	14.8
Engineering Mechanics	Men	54	14.8	25.9	16.7	29.6	13.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	54	14.8	25.9	16.7	29.6	13.0
Metallurgical Engineering	Men	14	28.6	50.0	14.3	7.1	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	14	28.6	50.0	14.3	7.1	0.0
Mining Engineering	Men	7	57.1	14.3	0.0	28.6	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	7	57.1	14.3	0.0	28.6	0.0
Naval and Marine Engineering	Men	5	60.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	5	60.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
English	Men	258	19.4	15.5	25.2	27.5	12.4
	Women	35	8.6	17.1	28.6	20.0	25.7
	Total	293	18.1	15.7	25.6	26.6	14.0
English and Speech	Men	26	23.1	15.4	26.9	34.6	0.0
	Women	9	11.1	22.2	55.6	11.1	0.0
	Total	35	20.0	17.1	34.3	28.6	0.0
Entomology	Men	8	25.0	12.5	50.0	12.5	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	8	25.0	12.5	50.0	12.5	0.0

Table 26 (Continued)

Subject-area		Number of Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
Evaluation Services	Men	10	30.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	10	30.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	0.0
Field Services	Men	2	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	3	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Fine Arts	Men	12	33.3	25.0	8.3	25.0	8.3
	Women	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0
	Total	15	26.7	20.0	13.3	33.3	6.7
Foreign Studies	Men	16	18.8	31.2	25.0	25.0	0.0
	Women	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	18	16.7	33.3	27.8	22.2	0.0
Forestry and Natural Resources	Men	48	29.2	33.3	29.2	6.2	2.1
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	48	29.2	33.3	29.2	6.2	2.1
French	Men	11	18.2	18.2	18.2	9.1	36.4
	Women	5	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	80.0
	Total	16	12.5	18.8	12.5	6.2	50.0
General Education	Men	16	0.0	18.8	50.0	12.5	18.8
	Women	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Total	21	0.0	14.3	38.1	9.5	38.1
Geography	Men	38	18.4	21.1	31.6	23.7	5.3
	Women	3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3
	Total	41	17.1	22.0	29.3	24.4	7.3
Geology	Men	39	46.2	20.5	17.9	12.8	2.6
	Women	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
	Total	41	43.9	19.5	19.5	12.2	4.9
German	Men	27	29.6	18.5	14.8	33.3	3.7
	Women	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	Total	28	28.6	17.9	14.3	35.7	3.6
History	Men	77	29.9	24.7	26.0	16.9	2.6
	Women	6	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	83	31.3	22.9	27.7	15.7	2.4
Home Economics	Men	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	83	12.0	19.3	27.7	33.7	7.2
	Total	83	12.0	19.3	27.7	33.7	7.2

Table 26 (Continued)

Subject-area		Number of Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
Hotel Administration	Men	12	25.0	8.3	25.0	33.3	8.3
	Women	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	14	21.4	14.3	28.6	28.6	7.1
Humanities	Men	32	12.5	12.5	46.9	25.0	3.1
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	32	12.5	12.5	46.9	25.0	3.1
Industrial Arts	Men	30	13.3	30.0	50.0	6.7	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	30	13.3	30.0	50.0	6.7	0.0
Industrial Technology	Men	49	4.1	14.3	24.5	6.1	51.0
	Women	2	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	51	3.9	13.7	27.5	5.9	49.0
Journalism	Men	31	25.8	25.8	19.4	22.6	6.5
	Women	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Total	32	25.0	25.0	18.8	21.9	9.4
Laboratory Schools	Men	42	0.0	2.4	85.7	11.9	0.0
	Women	49	0.0	6.1	65.3	28.6	0.0
	Total	91	0.0	4.4	74.7	20.9	0.0
Languages, Modern and Foreign	Men	85	17.6	21.2	30.6	23.5	7.1
	Women	19	5.3	21.1	15.8	36.8	21.1
	Total	104	15.4	21.2	27.9	26.0	9.6
Law	Men	58	55.2	12.1	8.6	6.9	17.2
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	58	55.2	12.1	8.6	6.9	17.2
Library Science	Men	9	22.2	22.2	44.4	11.1	0.0
	Women	7	0.0	28.6	28.6	28.6	14.3
	Total	16	12.5	25.0	37.5	18.8	6.2
Mathematics and Statistics	Men	226	20.4	15.9	27.0	16.4	20.4
	Women	37	0.0	2.7	40.5	43.2	13.5
	Total	263	17.5	14.1	28.9	20.2	19.4
Medicine	Men	11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Women	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Total	12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Table 26 (Continued)

Subject-area		Number of Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
Mortuary Science	Men	6	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	6	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
Music	Men	132	24.2	19.7	33.3	16.7	6.1
	Women	53	5.7	20.8	30.2	28.3	15.1
	Total	185	18.9	20.0	32.4	20.0	8.6
Natural Science	Men	36	11.1	5.6	41.7	41.7	0.0
	Women	6	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
	Total	42	9.5	4.8	42.9	42.9	0.0
Nursing	Men	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Women	46	4.3	19.6	28.3	39.1	8.7
	Total	48	4.2	18.8	27.1	37.5	12.5
Occupational Therapy	Men	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
	Women	7	0.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	57.1
	Total	9	0.0	0.0	44.4	0.0	55.6
Pharmacy	Men	29	20.7	24.1	27.6	6.9	20.7
	Women	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Total	30	20.0	23.3	26.7	6.7	23.3
Philosophy	Men	34	26.5	17.6	17.6	32.4	5.9
	Women	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Total	36	25.0	16.7	16.7	30.6	11.1
Physical Education	Men	118	11.0	28.8	33.9	11.9	14.4
	Women	62	11.3	12.9	30.6	33.9	11.3
	Total	180	11.1	23.3	32.8	19.4	13.3
Physical Science	Men	10	40.0	0.0	30.0	10.0	20.0
	Women	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	11	36.4	9.1	27.3	9.1	18.2
Physics	Men	142	16.2	14.8	30.3	7.7	31.0
	Women	3	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0
	Total	145	16.6	14.5	29.7	9.0	30.3
Physics and Chemistry	Men	9	11.1	55.6	22.2	11.1	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	9	11.1	55.6	22.2	11.1	0.0

Table 26 (Continued)

Subject-area		Number of Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
Police Administration	Men	10	20.0	40.0	20.0	10.0	10.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	10	20.0	40.0	20.0	10.0	10.0
Political Science	Men	82	24.4	18.3	32.9	19.5	4.9
	Women	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
	Total	84	23.8	17.9	32.1	20.2	6.0
Psychology	Men	107	18.7	22.4	23.4	19.6	15.9
	Women	11	9.1	18.2	18.2	27.3	11.0
	Total	118	17.8	22.0	22.9	20.3	16.9
Psychology and Education	Men	39	25.6	23.1	46.2	5.1	0.0
	Women	26	3.8	7.7	80.8	7.7	0.0
	Total	65	16.9	16.9	60.0	6.2	0.0
Religion, Theology	Men	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Slavic	Men	8	12.5	25.0	37.5	25.0	0.0
	Women	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
	Total	10	10.0	20.0	30.0	30.0	10.0
Social Sciences	Men	81	16.0	24.7	42.0	16.0	1.2
	Women	6	16.7	0.0	33.3	50.0	0.0
	Total	87	16.1	23.0	41.4	18.4	1.1
Social Work	Men	18	33.3	27.8	16.7	0.0	22.2
	Women	18	11.1	44.4	27.8	0.0	16.7
	Total	36	22.2	36.1	22.2	0.0	19.4
Sociology	Men	35	25.7	28.6	17.1	17.1	11.4
	Women	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Total	38	23.7	26.3	18.4	18.4	13.2
Sociology and Anthropology	Men	35	17.1	11.4	42.9	5.7	22.9
	Women	4	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
	Total	39	15.4	10.3	41.0	10.3	23.1
Spanish	Men	12	16.7	33.3	8.3	8.3	33.3
	Women	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
	Total	14	14.3	28.6	14.3	7.1	35.7

Table 26 (Continued)

Subject-area		Number of Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
Speech and Drama	Men	121	19.8	15.7	28.1	25.6	10.7
	Women	24	0.0	8.3	33.3	41.7	16.7
	Total	145	16.6	14.5	29.0	28.3	11.7
Unclassified, Graduate School	Men	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Veterinary Medicine	Men	28	35.7	14.3	25.0	25.0	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	28	35.7	14.3	25.0	25.0	0.0
Zoology	Men	40	30.0	27.5	25.0	17.5	0.0
	Women	3	0.0	0.0	33.0	66.7	0.0
	Total	43	27.9	25.6	25.6	20.9	0.0
All Subject-areas Combined	Men	4,082	21.4	19.9	27.5	17.2	13.9
	Women	793	7.3	15.1	32.3	27.4	17.9
	Total	4,875	19.1	19.1	28.3	18.9	14.6

19.3 per cent were associate professors, 27.7 per cent were assistant professors, 33.7 per cent were instructors, and 7.2 per cent were "Other." From this table it is possible, therefore, to compare individual subject-areas on the matter of academic rank distributions. Of the total group of faculty members in the State-controlled institutions, 19.1 per cent are full professors. A number of subject-areas show unusually higher percentages for this rank, as for example, chemical engineering, history, law, and veterinary medicine.

It was pointed out above that in the State-controlled institutions the percentage in the two highest academic ranks was lower for women than for the men. Table 26 permits the identification of the specific subject-areas in which these differences occur most prominently as well as those subject-areas in which the opposite may be true. Thus, of the 35 women faculty reported under business administration, 2.9 per cent are full professors, and 20.0 per cent are associate professors, while the percentage distribution for the men is similar to the distribution for these institutions as a group. A similar situation occurs in education and English with slightly over 8 per cent of the women in these subject-areas being full professors. The area of biology has the most favorable percentage distribution as far as women faculty members are concerned.

The distribution of faculty members by academic rank, sex, and subject-area taught in the privately controlled institutions is shown in Table 27. Particularly low percentages are noted in the upper academic ranks in business administration, general engineering, industrial engineering, physical education, political science, science and mathematics. Particularly high percentages are noted in the areas of religion and theology, social science, and history. French, German, and Spanish show rather uneven distributions in the four ranks.

Table 27. Percentage of All Faculty Members Holding Each Rank, for Each Subject-area, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Subject-area		Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank:				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
Anthropology	Men	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
	Total	3	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0
Architecture	Men	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Art and Design	Men	16	6.2	12.5	18.8	25.0	37.5
	Women	10	20.0	40.0	0.0	30.0	10.0
	Total	26	11.5	23.1	11.5	26.9	26.9
Biology	Men	34	23.5	14.7	38.2	11.8	11.8
	Women	21	9.5	28.6	23.8	19.0	19.0
	Total	55	18.2	20.0	32.7	14.5	14.5
Biological Science	Men	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Business Administration	Men	169	4.7	7.1	24.3	20.0	43.8
	Women	17	5.9	11.8	11.8	41.2	29.4
	Total	186	4.8	7.5	23.1	22.0	42.5
Chemistry	Men	60	23.3	10.0	18.3	20.0	28.3
	Women	10	10.0	20.0	20.0	30.0	20.0
	Total	70	21.4	11.4	18.6	21.4	27.1
Classics	Men	5	20.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	0.0
	Women	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
	Total	7	28.6	14.3	14.3	42.9	0.0
Economics	Men	51	13.7	19.6	17.6	19.6	29.4
	Women	6	0.0	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7
	Total	57	12.3	19.3	19.3	21.1	28.1
Education	Men	38	31.6	10.5	13.2	10.5	34.2
	Women	42	11.9	4.8	23.8	33.3	26.2
	Total	80	21.2	7.5	18.8	22.5	30.0
Engineering, All Types	Men	193	10.4	9.8	27.5	45.6	6.7
	Women	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	194	10.3	9.8	27.8	45.4	6.7

Table 27, Continued.

Subject-area		Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank:				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
Aeronautical Engineering	Men	3	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	3	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
Architectural Engineering	Men	7	28.6	0.0	14.3	57.1	0.0
	Women	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	8	25.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	0.0
Chemical Engineering	Men	8	25.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	37.5
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	8	25.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	37.5
Civil and Sanitary Engineering	Men	14	14.3	14.3	28.6	42.9	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	14	14.3	14.3	28.6	42.9	0.0
Electrical Engineering	Men	18	22.2	0.0	16.7	55.6	5.6
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	18	22.2	0.0	16.7	55.6	5.6
General Engineering	Men	65	3.1	6.2	21.5	66.2	3.1
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	65	3.1	6.2	21.5	66.2	3.1
Industrial Engineering	Men	26	3.8	23.1	57.7	15.4	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	26	3.8	23.1	57.7	15.4	0.0
Mechanical Engineering	Men	25	12.0	8.0	20.0	36.0	24.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	25	12.0	8.0	20.0	36.0	24.0
Engineering Mechanics	Men	27	14.8	14.8	33.3	33.3	3.7
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	27	14.8	14.8	33.3	33.3	3.7
English	Men	132	14.4	12.1	30.3	25.0	18.2
	Women	48	8.3	14.6	33.3	33.3	10.4
	Total	180	12.8	12.8	31.1	27.2	16.1
Fine Arts	Men	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 27, Continued.

Subject-area		Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank:				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
French	Men	5	20.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0
	Women	7	71.4	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0
	Total	12	50.0	0.0	33.3	8.3	8.3
German	Men	7	14.3	14.3	0.0	42.9	28.6
	Women	4	0.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
	Total	11	9.1	36.4	0.0	36.4	18.2
Greek	Men	5	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	40.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	5	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	40.0
History	Men	36	27.8	25.0	27.8	13.9	5.6
	Women	10	20.0	20.0	10.0	50.0	0.0
	Total	46	26.1	23.9	23.9	21.7	4.3
Home Economics	Men	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	19	15.8	31.6	5.3	36.8	10.5
	Total	19	15.8	31.6	5.3	36.8	10.5
Humanities	Men	11	0.0	0.0	36.4	54.5	9.1
	Women	11	27.3	18.2	18.2	27.3	9.1
	Total	22	13.6	9.1	27.3	40.9	9.1
Industrial Technology	Men	74	4.1	20.3	36.5	39.2	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	74	4.1	20.3	36.5	39.2	0.0
Journalism	Men	4	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	50.0
	Women	5	60.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0
	Total	9	33.3	11.1	11.1	22.2	22.2
Languages, Modern and Foreign	Men	31	9.7	29.0	38.7	16.1	6.5
	Women	14	21.4	7.1	21.4	35.7	14.3
	Total	45	13.3	22.2	33.3	22.2	8.9
Latin	Men	7	57.1	14.3	0.0	0.0	28.6
	Women	6	16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3	0.0
	Total	13	38.5	23.1	7.7	15.4	15.4
Law	Men	38	13.2	2.6	5.3	7.9	71.1
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	38	13.2	2.6	5.3	7.9	71.1

Table 27, Continued.

Subject-area		Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank:				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
Library Science	Men	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	4	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	0.0
	Total	4	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	0.0
Mathematics and Statistics	Men	63	17.5	4.8	17.5	44.4	15.9
	Women	18	16.7	5.6	27.8	33.3	16.7
	Total	81	17.3	4.9	19.8	42.0	16.0
Music	Men	59	15.3	13.6	15.3	55.9	0.0
	Women	46	6.5	10.9	17.4	58.7	6.5
	Total	105	11.4	12.4	16.2	57.1	2.9
Philosophy	Men	33	30.3	15.2	15.2	24.2	15.2
	Women	6	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
	Total	39	35.9	12.8	17.9	20.5	12.8
Physical Education	Men	31	6.5	12.9	35.5	32.3	12.9
	Women	21	9.5	14.3	14.3	61.9	0.0
	Total	52	7.7	13.5	26.9	44.2	7.7
Physics	Men	33	21.2	21.2	27.3	24.2	6.1
	Women	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Total	34	20.6	20.6	26.5	23.5	8.8
Political Science	Men	18	11.1	22.2	16.7	22.2	27.8
	Women	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	Total	20	10.0	20.0	15.0	30.0	25.0
Psychology	Men	56	19.6	23.2	28.6	12.5	16.1
	Women	15	13.3	13.3	26.7	26.7	20.0
	Total	71	18.3	21.1	28.2	15.5	16.9
Psychology and Education	Men	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Religion, Theology	Men	70	38.6	22.9	15.7	15.7	7.1
	Women	9	33.3	0.0	22.2	44.4	0.0
	Total	79	38.0	20.3	16.5	19.0	6.3
Science and Mathematics	Men	43	4.7	16.3	51.2	27.9	0.0
	Women	5	20.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	0.0
	Total	48	6.2	14.6	47.9	31.2	0.0

Table 27, Continued.

Subject-area		Faculty in Each Subject-area	Percentage of Total at Each Rank:				
			Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Others
Social Sciences	Men	11	27.3	36.4	18.2	9.1	9.1
	Women	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	12	33.3	33.3	16.7	8.3	8.3
Social Work	Men	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Women	5	20.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0
	Total	5	20.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0
Sociology	Men	30	23.3	23.3	16.7	26.7	10.0
	Women	10	20.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	0.0
	Total	40	22.5	22.5	12.5	35.0	7.5
Spanish	Men	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
	Women	5	60.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
	Total	7	57.1	0.0	0.0	42.9	0.0
Speech and Drama	Men	27	11.1	11.1	33.3	37.0	7.4
	Women	12	16.7	16.7	25.0	33.3	8.3
	Total	39	12.8	12.8	30.8	35.9	7.7
Unclassified, Graduate Schools	Men	6	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0
	Women	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total	6	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0
All Subject-areas Combined	Men	1,406	15.3	14.0	25.1	27.5	18.1
	Women	395	16.2	14.2	20.3	37.7	11.6
	Total	1,801	15.5	14.0	24.0	29.8	16.7

It was pointed out above that, in general, women faculty members in the privately controlled institutions have essentially the same percentage distributions among the ranks that the men do. In certain subject-areas, such as biology, education, and chemistry, the men predominate in the upper ranks, while women predominate in these ranks in art and design, French, and Spanish.

Rank and Years of Service at Present Institution

Tables 28 and 29 present data relating academic rank with years of service at the institution of present employment, the former table for the State-controlled institutions and the latter table for the privately controlled institutions. Since there are no academic rank designations in the community colleges, a table such as this could not be prepared for them.

A comparison of the median years of service at each of the academic ranks in the institution of present employment clearly indicates the relationship existing between years of service and academic rank. That is, one finds a progressively increasing median age for the individual ranks from the rank of instructor to the rank of full professor. This relationship is quite similar in the State-controlled and privately controlled institutions, except that the median of years of service for the full professor in the State-controlled institutions is slightly higher than the median for this same rank in the privately controlled institutions.

Table 28. Distribution of Faculty Members by Years of Service at Present Institution and Academic Rank in the Group of State-controlled Institutions.

Years of Previous Service at This Institution	Number at Each Academic Rank				
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other Ranks
0	31	61	262	336	253
1	26	62	205	255	135
2	20	53	160	158	90
3	13	32	92	74	45
4	25	46	96	30	28
5	20	39	66	22	23
6 - 7	47	83	97	24	21
8 - 9	96	139	106	12	26
10 - 14	212	222	197	15	65
15 - 19	121	54	37	0	18
20 - 24	84	48	14	0	6
25 - 29	103	47	28	0	6
30 - 34	80	34	10	1	2
35 and over	55	15	14	0	3
Totals	933	935	1,384	927	721
Median	14.5	9.3	3.7	1.5	1.8

Table 29. Distribution of Faculty Members by Years of Service at Present Institution and Academic Rank in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions.

Years of Previous Service at This Institution	Number at Each Academic Rank				
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other Ranks
0	3	9	42	85	95
1	9	19	79	208	55
2	9	17	45	80	30
3	15	10	32	37	30
4	7	13	56	31	12
5	15	14	29	17	15
6 - 7	23	19	43	25	15
8 - 9	22	27	32	19	23
10 - 14	49	71	59	19	24
15 - 19	39	27	10	3	10
20 - 24	23	13	3	3	4
25 - 29	26	10	2	7	4
30 - 34	28	4	1	7	0
35 and over	13	0	1	0	1
Totals	281	253	434	541	318
Median	13.0	9.9	3.3	1.9	2.3

CHAPTER IV

ACADEMIC DEGREES HELD

In the evaluation of quality in college and university faculties, the highest earned degree held has probably been used more extensively than any other single criterion. It should be recognized that there are other criteria which must be used in addition to the one of the highest degree earned, and, furthermore, that these criteria, in some instances may overbalance the factor of degree held. In the main, though, in procurement of new staff as well as consideration of qualifications for academic ranks, as stated by many of the institutions, the highest degree earned plays an important role. The colleges and universities have come to look upon the Doctor of Philosophy Degree, or its equivalent, in most areas of learning, as basic to college teaching and research. The fields of learning in which the doctorate is not offered are gradually decreasing in number. In the estimates of future supply and demand of teaching staff for higher education, the possession of the doctorate by prospective faculty should continue to be one of the primary criteria to be considered.

Highest Degree Earned

Table 30 presents data on highest earned degree of faculties in the colleges and universities in Michigan during the fall of 1957. For purposes of reference, percentages are also given on 637 degree-granting institutions throughout the country.

Three facts stand out clearly from this table. First, the degree-granting institutions in the State of Michigan as a group have a slightly smaller percentage of doctorates on their staffs than the group of 637 degree-granting institutions reporting to the National Education Association. The Michigan institutions even have a somewhat lower percentage of master's degrees on their staffs, but more bachelor's degree people.

Second, the State-controlled institutions of Michigan have a higher percentage of doctorates on their staffs than the large group of institutions cited. The Michigan institutions have 45.3 per cent doctorates as compared to 40.5 per cent in the 637 degree-granting institutions reported by the National Education Association.

Table 30. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned, in Each of the Three Types of Institutions in Michigan, Fall 1957.

Institutions	Doctorate		Master's or Second Professional		Bachelor's or First Professional		Other	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
State-controlled	2,217	45.3	2,092	42.7	525	10.7	66	1.3
Privately Controlled	382	21.0	872	47.9	508	27.9	59	3.2
Total: Degree-granting Institutions in Michigan	2,599	38.7	2,964	44.1	1,033	15.4	125	1.9
Community Colleges	39	5.3	556	76.9	113	15.6	16	2.2
Totals	2,638	35.4	3,520	47.3	1,146	15.4	141	1.9
In 637 Degree-granting Institutions for 1953-54*	23,768	40.5	28,848	49.1	6,103	10.4	-	-

*National Education Association, Teacher Supply and Demand in Colleges and Universities, 1957, Table F, p.48.

Third, the privately controlled institutions of Michigan, as a group, have proportionately, about half as many doctorates on their staffs as do the State-controlled institutions or the 637 degree-granting institutions had during 1953-54. Two comments should be made about this situation. First, there are, as one can see from Table 22, at least four privately controlled institutions in Michigan with a percentage of doctorates higher than the average for the 637 institutions, and there are several others with percentages in the high 30's. Second, the group of privately controlled institutions in this study contains quite a variety of colleges and universities, some, in fact, in which the doctorate may not have the same relevance as it would in the typical liberal arts college. Furthermore, there is a difference in the percentage of doctorates in privately controlled institutions which are accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and those which are not accredited by that organization. The data of this summary are given in Table 31.

Table 31. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned, in the Accredited and Unaccredited Privately Controlled Institutions in Michigan, Fall 1957.

Privately Controlled	Doctorate		Master's or Second Professional		Bachelor's or First Professional		Other		
Institutions	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Total
Accredited Institutions	303	27.5	558	50.6	223	20.2	18	1.6	1,102
Unaccredited Institutions	79	11.0	314	43.7	285	39.6	41	5.7	719
Totals	382	21.0	872	47.9	508	27.9	59	3.2	1,821

Tables 32, 33, and 34 present data on the percentages of faculty having the doctorate, master's, and bachelor's degrees in the individual institutions. In addition to these three categories, which were defined previously, a fourth category,

Table 32. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each State-controlled Institution Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned.

	Highest Degree Earned								
	Doctorate		Master's or Second Professional		Bachelor's or First Professional		Other		
Institution	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Total
Central Michigan College	95	42.6	124	55.6	4	1.8	0	0.0	223
Eastern Michigan College	73	23.7	200	65.0	34	11.0	1	0.3	308
Ferris Institute	21	16.8	65	52.0	24	19.2	15	12.0	125
Mich. Col. of M&T (Houghton)	35	21.6	92	56.8	26	16.0	9	5.6	162
Mich. Col. of M&T (Sault Br.)	6	18.2	20	60.6	7	21.2	0	0.0	33
Michigan State University	765	54.3	484	34.4	150	10.7	9	0.6	1,408
Northern Michigan College	25	35.2	38	53.5	8	11.3	0	0.0	71
University of Michigan	687	58.3	362	30.7	107	9.1	22	1.9	1,178
Wayne State University	391	35.7	545	49.7	150	13.7	10	0.9	1,096
Western Michigan University	119	40.2	162	54.7	15	5.1	0	0.0	296
Totals	2,217	45.3	2,092	42.7	525	10.7	66	1.3	4,900

"Other" includes: No degree.

Certificates in: cosmetology, refrigeration, radio, printing, or accounting.

Diplomas (Diplomates) in: history, Romance languages, painting, music, engineering, home economics, commerce, physical education and fencing master, or teacher education.

Table 33. Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Privately Controlled Institution Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned.

	Highest Degree Earned			
	Doctorate	Master's or Second Professional	Bachelor's or First Professional	Other
Institution	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent
P-62	71.4	14.3	14.3	0.0
P-42	54.6	42.4	3.0	0.0
P-39	47.1	45.1	7.8	0.0
P-36	46.8	48.9	4.3	0.0
P-57	44.8	51.7	3.5	0.0
P-2	39.3	54.7	3.6	2.4
P-40	36.4	63.6	0.0	0.0
P-3	35.4	60.4	4.2	0.0
P-43	31.9	49.0	17.0	2.1
P-10	30.8	7.7	46.1	15.4
P-54	29.4	58.8	11.8	0.0
P-16	29.0	44.0	24.0	3.0
P-50	28.6	57.1	14.3	0.0
P-41	28.4	55.4	12.2	4.0
P-48	26.9	69.2	3.9	0.0
P-27	22.2	57.8	20.0	0.0
P-60	20.7	45.9	32.1	1.3
P-1	19.3	67.7	6.5	6.5
P-5	17.3	65.4	15.4	1.9
P-59	15.8	31.6	42.1	10.5
P-11	14.3	57.1	0.0	28.6
P-52	13.3	26.7	53.3	6.7
P-21	11.8	36.4	50.9	0.9
P-56	11.1	66.7	22.2	0.0
P-31	10.0	40.0	40.0	10.0
P-12	5.3	26.3	57.9	10.5
P-34	2.4	50.9	38.6	8.1
P-38	1.7	37.1	56.9	4.3
P-18	0.0	14.3	85.7	0.0
P-61	0.0	61.5	38.5	0.0
P-19	0.0	53.0	29.4	17.6
Totals	21.0	47.9	27.9	3.2

Table 34. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Community College Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned.

	Highest Degree Earned								
	Doctorate		Master's or Second Professional		Bachelor's or First Professional		Other		
Institution	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Total
Alpena Community College	1	4.8	16	76.2	4	19.0	0	0.0	21
Battle Creek Community College	1	7.7	12	92.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	13
Bay City Junior College	3	3.6	56	66.7	19	22.6	6	7.1	84
Benton Harbor Community College	0	0.0	22	95.7	1	4.3	0	0.0	23
Flint Junior College	19	10.9	134	77.0	20	11.5	1	0.6	174
Gogebic Community College	1	5.9	10	58.8	6	35.3	0	0.0	17
Grand Rapids Junior College	4	5.0	67	82.7	9	11.1	1	1.2	81
Henry Ford Community College	1	1.2	62	72.9	22	25.9	0	0.0	85
Highland Park Junior College	4	6.8	46	78.0	9	15.2	0	0.0	59
Jackson Junior College	1	2.1	32	65.3	8	16.3	8	16.3	49
Lansing Community College	0	0.0	8	72.7	3	27.3	0	0.0	11
Muskegon Community College	1	2.9	29	82.8	5	14.3	0	0.0	35
Northwestern Michigan College	1	4.5	20	91.0	1	4.5	0	0.0	22
Port Huron Junior College	2	6.7	22	73.3	6	20.0	0	0.0	30
South Macomb Community College	0	0.0	19	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	19
Totals	39	5.3	556	76.9	113	15.6	16	2.2	723

"Other," has been used to include faculty who do not hold any degree, who hold certificates in such areas as printing, accounting, radio, etc. It also includes holders of diplomas from U. S. and foreign institutions in such areas as history, Romance languages, painting, music, etc.

Among the State-controlled institutions, two universities, the University of Michigan and Michigan State University stand out prominently with the highest percentages of doctorates on their staffs. At the University of Michigan the percentage is 58.3 and at Michigan State University it is 54.3 per cent. These percentages are substantially higher than the average for the group of ten State-controlled institutions in Michigan, and are considerably higher than those reported for the 637 degree-granting institutions for 1953-54 by the National Education Association. The State of Michigan must take pride in the financial support given these institutions in the past in order that they might attain such a high standard on this criterion.

The situation in the privately controlled institutions, Table 33, has already been discussed. For the community colleges, Table 34, the percentage of those holding the master's degree is 73.9, with 8.4 per cent holding the doctorate. Considering the fact that these institutions offer only the freshmen and sophomore subject matter, plus technical and pre-professional training, one must conclude that the educational preparation of the community college staffs is, in general, excellent.

Highest Degree Earned and Academic Rank

The relationship between academic rank and the highest degree earned by members of faculties in the State-controlled and privately controlled institutions may be studied from data in Tables 35 and 36. These tables give, for each of the academic ranks, the number of faculty members with the doctorate, the master's, the

Table 35. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members of Each Academic Rank Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions of Michigan.

Academic Rank	Ph.D. or Other Comparable Doctor's Degree		Master's or Second Professional Degree		Bachelor's or First Professional Degree		No Degree		Total Number of Faculty Members
	Number	Per Cent of Total in Rank	Number	Per Cent of Total in Rank	Number	Per Cent of Total in Rank	Number	Per Cent of Total in Rank	
Professor	682	73.1	179	19.2	66	7.1	6	0.6	933
Associate Professor	578	61.8	318	34.0	31	3.3	8	0.9	935
Assistant Professor	693	50.1	609	44.0	73	5.3	9	0.7	1,384
Instructor	156	16.8	611	65.9	148	16.0	12	1.3	927
Other Rank	108	15.0	375	52.0	207	28.7	31	4.3	721
Totals	2,217	45.3	2,092	42.7	525	10.7	66	1.3	4,900

Table 36. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members of Each Academic Rank Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions in Michigan.

Academic Rank	Ph.D. or Other Comparable Doctor's Degree		Master's or Second Professional Degree		Bachelor's or First Professional Degree		No Degree		Total Number of Faculty Members
	Number	Per Cent of Total in Rank	Number	Per Cent of Total in Rank	Number	Per Cent of Total in Rank	Number	Per Cent of Total in Rank	
Professor	166	59.1	96	34.2	15	5.3	4	1.4	281
Associate Professor	71	28.1	150	59.3	28	11.1	4	1.6	253
Assistant Professor	89	20.5	256	59.0	76	17.5	13	3.0	434
Instructor	38	7.0	274	50.6	209	38.6	20	3.7	541
Other Rank	18	5.7	101	31.8	181	56.9	18	5.7	318
Totals	382	20.9	877	48.0	509	27.9	59	3.2	1,827

bachelor's, or no degree. Also given are percentages of the total in each rank who have the given degree. Thus, in Table 32, of the 933 full professors, 682, or 73.1 per cent, hold the Ph.D. or comparable doctor's degree. It is clear from the column headed "Per Cent of Total in Rank" that, in the State-controlled institutions, the largest percentages of those holding the two highest academic ranks also have an earned doctorate. It is also evident that, in the privately controlled institutions, the upper two ranks, especially the associate professor, have a much smaller percentage of doctorates than in the State-controlled institutions. This fact is also pointed out in the total percentages given in the tables, with 20.9, 48.0, and 27.9 per cent of the faculty in the privately controlled institutions having the doctor's, master's, and bachelor's degree, respectively, as compared to 45.3 per cent, 42.7 per cent, and 10.7 per cent in the State-controlled institutions. One explanation of this would lie, of course, in the fact that several of the State-controlled institutions have graduate programs leading to the master's and doctor's degrees, which would require a much higher proportion of faculty with the doctor's degree. Another possibility is that the institutional requirements for the several academic ranks may be more rigidly defined in the State-controlled institutions than in the privately controlled ones.

Highest Degree Earned and Years of Service

Tables 37, 38, and 39 present data on the relationships of years of service at the institution of present employment and highest degree earned. Because no trend data are available on percentage of newly employed faculty holding the various degrees during the past years, these tables serve to indicate the level of the highest degree held by the faculty members being retained by the institutions in the State. It is quite clear from these tables that in the State-controlled

Table 37. Distribution of Faculty Members by Highest Degree Earned and Years of Service at Present Institution in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

	Highest Degree Held							
	Doctorate		Master's or Second Professional		Bachelor's or First Professional		Total	
Years of Service	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Cumulative Per Cent
0	281	30.2	443	47.7	205	22.1	929	19.2
1	274	41.2	291	43.8	100	15.0	665	33.0
2	191	40.0	238	49.8	49	10.2	478	42.9
3	108	42.5	127	50.0	19	7.5	254	48.1
4	129	57.9	79	35.4	15	6.7	223	52.7
5	84	50.3	66	39.5	17	10.2	167	56.2
6 - 7	151	55.9	103	38.2	16	5.9	270	61.8
8 - 9	221	58.8	133	35.4	22	5.8	376	69.5
10 - 14	381	54.4	285	40.6	35	5.0	701	84.1
15 - 19	131	57.7	86	37.9	10	4.4	227	88.7
20 - 24	84	56.0	58	38.7	8	5.3	150	91.8
25 - 29	86	47.3	86	47.3	10	5.4	182	95.6
30 - 34	61	48.8	58	46.4	6	4.8	125	98.2
35 and over	35	40.2	39	44.8	13	15.0	87	100.0
Totals	2,217	45.9	2,092	43.3	525	10.8	4,834	

Table 38. Distribution of Faculty Members by Highest Degree Earned and Years of Service at Present Institution in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Years of Service	Highest Degree Held							
	Doctorate		Master's or Second Professional		Bachelor's or First Professional		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Cumulative Per Cent
0	35	15.4	90	39.7	102	44.9	227	12.8
1	43	12.0	164	45.7	152	42.3	359	32.1
2	37	20.9	93	52.5	47	26.6	177	43.2
3	26	21.9	58	48.7	35	29.4	119	49.9
4	32	27.6	57	49.1	27	23.3	116	56.4
5	27	31.0	42	48.3	18	20.7	87	61.4
6 - 7	38	30.9	64	52.0	21	17.1	123	68.3
8 - 9	27	22.1	69	56.6	26	21.3	122	75.2
10 - 14	78	26.4	160	54.2	57	19.3	295	91.9
15 - 19	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	91.9
20 - 24	16	35.6	22	48.9	7	15.5	45	94.5
25 - 29	12	25.0	27	56.2	9	18.8	48	97.2
30 - 34	7	19.4	24	66.7	5	13.9	36	99.2
35 and over	4	28.6	7	50.0	3	21.4	14	100.0
Totals	382	21.6	877	49.6	509	28.8	1,768	

Table 39. Distribution of Faculty Members by Highest Degree Earned and Years of Service at Present Institution in the Group of Community Colleges, Fall 1957.

	Highest Degree Held							
	Doctorate		Master's or Second Professional		Bachelor's or First Professional		Total	
Years of Service	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Cumulative Per Cent
0	8	4.1	138	71.1	48	24.8	194	27.4
1	11	8.7	91	71.6	25	19.7	127	45.4
2	6	7.2	62	74.7	15	18.1	83	57.1
3	3	4.9	52	85.3	6	9.8	61	65.8
4	1	4.2	20	83.3	3	12.5	24	69.2
5	0	0.0	23	95.8	1	4.2	24	72.6
6 - 7	0	0.0	25	89.3	3	10.7	28	76.5
8 - 9	0	0.0	16	88.9	2	11.1	18	79.1
10 - 14	8	9.2	73	83.9	6	6.9	87	91.4
15 - 19	1	4.0	24	96.0	0	0.0	25	94.9
20 - 24	0	0.0	9	90.0	1	10.0	10	96.3
25 - 29	0	0.0	8	80.0	2	20.0	10	97.7
30 - 34	1	6.7	13	86.6	1	6.7	15	99.9
35 and over	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Totals	39	5.5	555	78.5	113	16.0	707	

and privately controlled institutions the highest percentages of faculties with the doctor's degree occur in the 5 to 25 years of service intervals. Within the last five years, the percentage of retained faculty with the doctorate has been decreasing in these two types of institutions. This reflects the general trend nationally. The community colleges in Michigan appear to be somewhat of an exception to this fact. In the Michigan community colleges the highest percentages of faculty with doctorates occur among faculty members with five or fewer years of service. The reasons for this may be that the holders of doctor's degrees tend to move on to degree-granting institutions, and the emphasis on the possession of the doctor's degree in the community college is a relatively recent development.

The problem of procuring a sufficient number of faculty with the doctorate is emphasized when one considers the fact that of the 778 faculty members at the State-controlled institutions with 10 or more years of service, 52 per cent hold the doctor's degree. This percentage is considerably higher than the over-all percentage of 45.9 per cent of doctorates for the entire group of faculty in the State-controlled institutions. A similar situation exists in the privately controlled institutions. This situation reflects the current decrease in the production of doctorates from graduate schools, as well as the increasing difficulty institutions are having and will have in the procurement of holders of doctor's degrees in competition with business and industry. The need to retain high academic and research standards in Michigan colleges and universities dictates that adequate support must be provided the institutions in order that they may increase their procurement and retention of the highest qualified faculty members.

Source of Highest Degree Earned

In addition to data on highest degree earned, the study asked for information regarding the source of this degree, whether it was obtained at the institution of present employment, at another Michigan institution, or at an institution outside of Michigan. Originally, it was hoped to obtain information on the specific institutions from which the degrees were obtained, but, again, this would have imposed an unusual clerical burden on the responding institutions. The three categories used in this study, namely, present institution of employment, another Michigan institution, an institution outside of Michigan, may be used in two ways. First, for those institutions that do not give the master's and doctor's degree, only the dichotomy, in Michigan or outside of Michigan will have much meaning. This is totally true in the case of the community colleges. All three of the criteria will have meaning for those institutions which give the master's and the doctor's degree. In other words, the State-controlled and privately controlled institutions cannot be compared on the factor of "institution of present employment" because only one or two of the reporting, privately controlled institutions give degrees beyond the bachelor's. A comparison such as this could be made if the specific degrees were identifiable.

The data of Tables 40, 41, and 42 indicate that the privately controlled and State-controlled institutions have, at present, over 50 per cent of the faculty with highest degree obtained at an institution outside of Michigan. No national norms are available for comparison, but one might judge that these percentages should be high enough to guarantee against what is often called "educational inbreeding."

In the community colleges as a group, only 38.9 per cent of the faculty obtained their highest degree from out of State, while 61.1 per cent obtained them from institutions in Michigan. All except three of the community colleges -- Alpena

Table 40. Sources of Highest Degree Earned for Faculty Members in Each State-controlled Institution.

Institution	Source of Highest Degree Earned					
	Institution of Present Employment		Another Michigan Institution		Institution Outside Michigan	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Central Michigan College	2	0.9	86	38.6	135	60.5
Eastern Michigan College	20	6.5	157	51.3	129	42.2
Ferris Institute	2	1.8	48	43.6	60	54.6
Michigan College of Mining & Tech. (Houghton)	35	22.9	38	24.8	80	52.3
Michigan College of Mining & Tech. (Sault Br.)	0	0.0	14	42.4	19	57.6
Michigan State University	278	19.8	137	9.8	987	70.4
Northern Michigan College	5	7.0	23	32.4	43	60.6
University of Michigan	502	43.1	20	1.7	644	55.2
Wayne State University	314	28.8	232	21.2	546	50.0
Western Michigan University	18	6.1	78	26.3	200	67.6
Totals	1,176	24.2	833	17.2	2,843	58.6

Table 41. Sources of Highest Degree Earned for Faculty Members in Each Privately Controlled Institution.

	Source of Highest Degree Earned		
	Institution of Present Employment	Another Michigan Institution	Institution Outside Michigan
Institution	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent
P-1	0.0	38.7	61.3
P-2	7.2	32.5	60.3
P-3	2.1	33.3	64.6
P-5	2.0	29.4	68.6
P-10	0.0	9.1	90.9
P-11	70.0	0.0	30.0
P-12	11.8	47.0	41.2
P-16	18.6	38.1	43.3
P-18	28.6	47.6	23.8
P-19	53.6	28.6	17.8
P-21	21.1	41.3	37.6
P-27	11.2	44.4	44.4
P-31	22.2	33.3	44.5
P-34	11.4	47.6	41.0
P-36	2.1	42.6	55.3
P-38	9.6	62.3	28.1
P-39	3.9	17.7	78.4
P-40	0.0	40.9	59.1
P-41	5.4	29.7	64.9
P-42	0.0	15.2	84.8
P-43	2.1	40.4	57.5
P-48	4.0	8.0	88.0
P-50	0.0	32.1	67.9
P-52	7.2	21.4	71.4
P-54	11.8	47.0	41.2
P-56	16.7	22.2	61.1
P-57	6.9	6.9	86.2
P-59	0.0	41.2	58.8
P-60	30.9	20.8	48.3
P-61	0.0	38.5	61.5
P-62	0.0	28.6	71.4
Totals	15.7	33.3	51.0

Table 42. Sources of Highest Degree Earned for Faculty Members in Each Community College.

Institution	Source of Highest Degree Earned			
	Another Michigan Institution		Institution Outside Michigan	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Alpena Community College	5	23.8	16	76.2
Battle Creek Community College	10	76.9	3	23.1
Bay City Junior College	52	67.5	25	32.5
Benton Harbor Community College	15	65.2	8	34.8
Flint Junior College	69	39.9	104	60.1
Gogebic Community College	5	29.4	12	70.6
Grand Rapids Junior College	58	73.4	21	26.6
Henry Ford Community College	74	87.1	11	12.9
Highland Park Junior College	43	72.9	16	27.1
Jackson Junior College	21	51.2	20	48.8
Lansing Community College	7	70.0	3	30.0
Muskegon Community College	19	54.3	16	45.7
Northwestern Michigan College	14	63.6	8	36.4
Port Huron Junior College	21	70.0	9	30.0
South Macomb Community College	17	89.5	2	10.5
Totals	430	61.1	274	38.9

Community College, Flint Junior College, and Gogebic Community College -- have less than 50 per cent of their faculties with degrees earned outside of Michigan.

For the Michigan institutions as a group, there appears to be no cause for criticism regarding an imbalance on the criterion of source of highest earned degree. Because the University of Michigan does offer extensive graduate programs toward the master's and doctor's degrees, it would be natural to expect a relatively large percentage of faculty with highest degree earned at that University. Of the 1,166 faculty members on whom data were received from the University of Michigan, 43.1 per cent have their highest degree from the University of Michigan, and only 1.7 per cent have their highest earned degree from another Michigan institution, with 55.2 per cent having received their highest degree from an institution outside of Michigan. Michigan State University, with a somewhat smaller graduate program, presently employs faculty only 19.8 per cent of whom have their highest degree from that institution. Of the 1,402 faculty members on whom data were reported by Michigan State University, 70.4 per cent have their highest earned degree from an institution from out of state, and 9.8 per cent from other institutions in Michigan.

In the case of the University of Michigan, its 1.7 per cent of faculty with highest degree earned at another Michigan institution, represents 20 individual faculty members, six of whom have been there for 5 years or more; and only one of whom is a full professor, five are associate professors, seven are assistant professors, and six are instructors. Only 3 of the 20 have a doctor's degree. It is evident, on the basis of these statistics, that the University of Michigan has a relatively small percentage of faculty whose highest degrees were obtained from other Michigan institutions.

Academic Rank and Source of Highest Degree Earned

The assertion is sometimes made that certain personnel policies, such as promotion in academic rank, are different for individuals whose degrees have been obtained from the same institution at which they are now employed than for those individuals whose degrees have been obtained from other institutions, especially from out of State. Tables 43 and 44 summarize data relating academic rank with highest degree held and the source of that degree.

Analysis of these data would indicate that these observations are quite unfounded, at least in the privately controlled and State-controlled institutions of the State. Thus, of the faculty in the State-controlled institutions with a doctorate obtained at an institution outside of Michigan, 30.7 per cent hold the rank of full professor, while of the faculty with a doctorate obtained from an institution in Michigan, 30.8 per cent hold the rank of full professor. Similar results are obtained for the privately controlled group. In the State-controlled institutions, for those with the Master's degree, the percentage holding the two highest ranks is slightly higher for those with the degree earned out of State than for those who earned the degree in an institution in Michigan, but the differences are not very large.

Table 43. Percentage of Faculty Members Holding Each Academic Rank, by Highest Degree Earned and by Source of Highest Degree, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions.

Highest Degree Held	Source of Degree	Percentage of Total in Each Academic Rank					Total Number
		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	
Ph.D. or other Comparable Doctor's Degree	This University	16.7	16.5	17.7	10.3	35.2	386
	Other Michigan Institution	11.6	10.4	11.5	6.4		239
	Institution Outside Michigan	71.7	73.1	70.7	83.3		1,590
	Total	30.8	26.0	31.3	7.0	4.9	2,215
Master's or Second Professional Degree	This Institution	8.8	9.7	15.6	34.4	31.5	578
	Other Michigan Institution	6.0	18.6	43.5	19.4	12.6	501
	Institution Outside Michigan	9.7	16.8	29.5	31.1	12.8	1,012
	Total	8.6	15.3	29.0	29.2	17.9	2,091
Bachelor's or First Professional Degree	This Institution	11.8	5.7	13.7	29.2	39.6	212
	Other Michigan Institution	6.7	5.6	16.9	24.7	46.1	89
	Institution Outside Michigan	15.6	6.7	12.9	28.4	36.4	225
	Total	12.5	6.1	13.9	28.1	39.4	526
Totals		19.2	19.2	28.4	18.9	14.3	4,832

Table 44. Percentage of Faculty Members Holding Each Academic Rank, by Highest Degree Earned and by Source of Highest Degree, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions.

Highest Degree Held	Source of Degree	Percentage of Total in Each Academic Rank					Total Number
		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	
Ph.D. or other Comparable Doctor's Degree	This University	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
	Other Michigan Institution	47.2	15.3	22.2	8.3	6.9	72
	Institution Outside Michigan	42.6	19.4	23.5	10.3	4.2	310
	Total	43.5	18.6	23.3	9.9	4.7	382
Master's or Second Professional Degree	This Institution	6.9	5.9	17.8	39.6	29.7	101
	Other Michigan Institution	9.8	16.2	33.2	31.8	8.9	358
	Institution Outside Michigan	12.9	20.6	28.5	28.5	9.5	417
	Total	11.0	17.1	29.2	31.2	11.5	876
Bachelor's or First Professional Degree	This Institution	2.3	5.3	8.8	37.4	46.2	171
	Other Michigan Institution	3.1	5.0	17.4	52.2	22.4	161
	Institution Outside Michigan	3.4	6.2	18.6	34.5	37.3	177
	Total	3.0	5.5	14.9	41.1	35.6	509
Totals		15.7	14.1	23.8	29.4	17.0	1,767

CHAPTER V

LEVEL OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE

In the community colleges of the State, each faculty member has instructional responsibility for only the one level of courses taught, namely, lower division, undergraduate. At degree-granting institutions offering only four-year programs, the faculty members have responsibility for undergraduate courses only. At institutions offering both undergraduate and graduate degrees, faculty members may be designated as responsible for undergraduate courses only, undergraduate and graduate courses, or graduate level courses only. Tables 45 and 46 present data on the faculties in the colleges and universities in Michigan according to the level of instructional service. In each table are given the number of faculty members at each level and the per cent this number is of the total number of faculty members at each institution, except that for the privately controlled institutions, the numbers are omitted to avoid the possibility of identification. Totals in the cross-tabulations may differ from preceding tables because a few incomplete responses were submitted.

At the community colleges, 100 per cent of the faculty are responsible for undergraduate course work only so no data need be presented for this group of institutions. At the privately controlled institutions, 87.4 per cent of the faculties are responsible for undergraduate courses only, 10.8 per cent for both undergraduate and graduate, and 1.8 per cent for graduate level teaching only. The low percentage teaching at the graduate level simply reflects the fact that only five of the privately controlled institutions have any programs leading toward advanced degrees.

Table 45. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each State-controlled Institution at Each Level of Instructional Service, Fall 1957.

Institution	Instructional Level						Number of Faculty
	Undergraduate Only		Both Levels		Graduate Only		
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	
Central Michigan College	184	82.5	38	17.1	1	0.4	223
Eastern Michigan College	259	84.7	35	11.4	12	3.9	306
Ferris Institute	125	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	125
Michigan College of Mining & Tech. (H)	119	73.5	43	26.5	0	0.0	162
Michigan College of Mining & Tech. (S)	33	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	33
Michigan State University	684	48.6	661	46.9	63	4.5	1,408
Northern Michigan College	69	97.2	2	2.8	0	0.0	71
University of Michigan	341	28.9	671	57.0	166	14.1	1,178
Wayne State University	437	40.2	595	54.8	54	5.0	1,086
Western Michigan University	134	45.4	161	54.6	0	0.0	295
Totals	2,385	48.8	2,206	45.1	296	6.1	4,887

Table 46. Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Privately Controlled Institution at Each Level of Instructional Service, Fall 1957.

Institution	Instructional Level		
	Undergraduate Only	Both Levels	Graduate Only
	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent
P-1	100.0		
P-2	98.8	1.2	
P-3	100.0		
P-5	100.0		
P-10	100.0		
P-11	7.1	78.6	14.3
P-12	100.0		
P-16	99.0	1.0	
P-18	100.0		
P-19	85.3	14.7	
P-21	100.0		
P-27	97.8	2.2	
P-31	100.0		
P-34	100.0		
P-36	100.0		
P-38	100.0		
P-39	100.0		
P-40	100.0		
P-41	100.0		
P-42	15.2	75.7	9.1
P-43	100.0		
P-48	100.0		
P-50	100.0		
P-52	100.0		
P-54	100.0		
P-56	100.0		
P-57	89.7	10.3	
P-59	78.9	15.8	5.3
P-60	65.6	31.4	3.0
P-61	100.0		
P-62			100.0
Group Averages	87.4	10.8	1.8

In the State-controlled institutions, 48.8 per cent of the faculty are responsible for undergraduate courses only, 45.1 per cent are responsible for both graduate and undergraduate courses, while 6.1 per cent are responsible for graduate courses only. Only four of the State-controlled institutions have any substantial numbers of staff assigned solely to graduate courses. These are Eastern Michigan College with 3.9 per cent, Michigan State University with 4.5 per cent, University of Michigan with 14.1 per cent, and Wayne State University with 5.0 per cent.

Level of Instruction and Highest Degree Earned

Table 47 summarizes data on highest degree earned and the level of instructional service in the three types of institutions. Given, for each level of instruction, is the number of doctorates, master's, and bachelor's degrees and the per cent each is of the total number of faculty at each of the levels.

For the faculty responsible for undergraduate courses only, 23.7 per cent have the doctorate in the State-controlled institutions, 17.8 per cent have the doctorate in the privately controlled institutions, and 5.4 per cent have the doctorate in the community colleges. At this same level of teaching service, in the State-controlled institutions 60.0 per cent have the master's degree, in the privately controlled institutions 51.1 per cent have the master's degree, and in the community colleges 78.8 per cent have the master's degree. Of those faculty responsible for undergraduate courses only, the bachelor's degree is the highest degree held by 16.3 per cent, 31.1 per cent, and 15.8 per cent in the State-controlled institutions, privately controlled institutions, and community colleges, respectively. It is clear that the privately controlled institutions, as a group have a considerably lower percentage of doctor's degree

Table 47. Number and Percentage of the Faculty Members at Each Level of Teaching Service Having Each Level of Highest Degree Earned for Each of the Three Types of Institutions, Fall 1957.

Level of Teaching Service and Degrees Held	State-controlled		Privately Controlled		Community Colleges		Totals for All Institutions	
	Number	Per Cent of Level	Number	Per Cent of Level	Number	Per Cent of Level	Number	Percentage of Level
Undergraduate Level Only:								
Ph.D.	550	23.7	271	17.8	38	5.4	859	18.9
M.A.	1,395	60.0	778	51.1	554	78.8	2,727	59.9
B.A.	379	16.3	473	31.1	111	15.8	963	21.2
Total	2,324	51.1	1,522	33.5	703	15.5	4,549	
Undergraduate and Graduate Level:								
Ph.D.	1,479	67.8	94	50.3	0	0.0	1,573	66.4
M.A.	605	27.7	78	41.7	0	0.0	683	28.8
B.A.	97	4.4	15	8.0	0	0.0	112	4.7
Total	2,181	92.1	187	7.9	0	0.0	2,368	
Graduate Only:								
Ph.D.	181	61.4	10	28.6	0	0.0	191	57.9
M.A.	73	24.7	16	45.7	0	0.0	89	27.0
B.A.	41	13.9	9	25.7	0	0.0	50	15.1
Total	295	89.4	35	10.6	0	0.0	330	

and master's-degree people teaching at the undergraduate level, and a higher percentage of bachelor's-degree faculty members at this level of instruction, than the State-controlled institutions or the community colleges have. It should be noted that the community colleges, with only lower division, undergraduate work, have a very high percentage of faculty with the master's degree. Of the 2,181 faculty members in State-controlled institutions who have responsibility for both undergraduate and graduate teaching, 67.8 per cent have the doctorate. In the privately controlled institutions, of the 187 faculty responsible for these levels of instruction, 50.3 per cent have the doctorate.

Highest Degree, Teaching Level, and Subject-area

Tables 48, 49, and 50 summarize data on teaching level, highest degree earned, and the subject-area of instruction. For example, in the State-controlled institutions, in which 23.7 per cent of those teaching only at the undergraduate level have the doctorate, percentages higher than this are found in subject-areas such as natural sciences, biology, chemistry, communication skills, social sciences, history, and the humanities. Physical education, certain areas of engineering, art and design, and architecture are areas in which the percentage of doctorates is lower than for the total group of State-controlled institutions. It should be recognized that in some of these subject-areas, the doctorate degree may, either not be available or just recently become available.

Teaching Level and Academic Rank

The distribution of faculty by academic rank and teaching level for the two types of institutions is given in Table 51. For the two types of institutions, by subject-area, the data are given in Tables 52 and 53. In Table 51, one finds that the percentage of full professors and associate professors teaching

Table 48. Number of Faculty Members Having Each Highest Degree Earned for Each Level of Instructional Service in Each Subject-area in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Agriculture				
Doctor's	8	74	7	89
Master's	24	20	2	46
Bachelor's	4	3	0	7
Total	36	97	9	142
Anatomy				
Doctor's	0	4	0	4
Master's	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's	3	2	0	5
Total	3	6	0	9
Anthropology				
Doctor's	0	8	1	9
Master's	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	0	8	1	9
Architecture				
Doctor's	2	0	0	2
Master's	22	9	2	33
Bachelor's	13	5	0	18
Total	37	14	2	53
Art and Design				
Doctor's	2	4	0	6
Master's	24	28	2	54
Bachelor's	7	1	0	8
Total	33	33	2	68
Astronomy				
Doctor's	2	2	2	6
Master's	1	0	0	1
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	3	2	2	7
Bacteriology				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	1	0	0	1
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	0	1

Table 48, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Biology				
Doctor's	13	21	0	34
Master's	13	2	0	15
Bachelor's	3	0	0	3
Total	29	23	0	52
Biological Science				
Doctor's	4	3	1	8
Master's	7	0	0	7
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	11	3	1	15
Botany				
Doctor's	4	29	4	37
Master's	2	4	0	6
Bachelor's	3	1	0	4
Total	9	34	4	47
Business Admn.				
Doctor's	24	77	6	107
Master's	90	42	2	134
Bachelor's	31	13	1	45
Total	145	132	9	286
Chemistry				
Doctor's	24	63	5	92
Master's	25	1	0	26
Bachelor's	10	1	0	11
Total	59	65	5	129
Chemistry and Chemical Engr.				
Doctor's	0	9	0	9
Master's	4	1	0	5
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	4	10	0	14
Classics				
Doctor's	0	8	0	8
Master's	4	1	0	5
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	4	9	0	13
Communication Skills				
Doctor's	41	1	0	42
Master's	21	0	0	21
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	63	1	0	64

Table 48, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Economics				
Doctor's	18	40	1	59
Master's	19	8	0	27
Bachelor's	7	1	0	8
Total	44	49	1	94
Education				
Doctor's	19	154	52	225
Master's	107	94	12	213
Bachelor's	8	2	0	10
Total	134	250	64	448
Engineering, All Types				
Doctor's	26	105	14	145
Master's	146	126	6	278
Bachelor's	82	23	3	108
Total	254	254	23	531
Aeronautical Engr.				
Doctor's	4	9	3	16
Master's	2	7	0	9
Bachelor's	1	2	0	3
Total	7	18	3	28
Chemical Engr.				
Doctor's	5	25	5	35
Master's	8	10	0	18
Bachelor's	2	1	0	3
Total	15	36	5	56
Civil and Sanitary Engineering				
Doctor's	0	16	1	17
Master's	11	24	3	38
Bachelor's	9	4	1	14
Total	20	44	5	69
Electrical Engr.				
Doctor's	6	14	4	24
Master's	35	21	2	58
Bachelor's	20	1	1	22
Total	61	36	7	104

Table 48, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
General Engineering				
Doctor's	1	0	0	1
Master's	16	4	0	20
Bachelor's	11	0	0	11
Total	28	4	0	32
Geological Engr.				
Doctor's	1	3	0	4
Master's	3	0	0	3
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	4	3	0	7
Industrial Engr.				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	1	7	0	8
Bachelor's	1	4	1	6
Total	2	11	1	14
Mechanical Engr.				
Doctor's	3	16	0	19
Master's	54	35	0	89
Bachelor's	26	7	0	33
Total	83	58	0	141
Engineering Mechs.				
Doctor's	6	14	1	21
Master's	11	10	1	22
Bachelor's	10	1	0	11
Total	27	25	2	54
Metallurgical Engr.				
Doctor's	0	7	0	7
Master's	1	5	0	6
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	2	12	0	14
Mining Engineering				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	4	2	0	6
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	5	2	0	7

Table 48, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Naval and Marine Engineering				
Doctor's	0	1	0	1
Master's	0	1	0	1
Bachelor's	0	3	0	3
Total	0	5	0	5
English				
Doctor's	61	77	8	146
Master's	118	14	1	133
Bachelor's	11	3	0	14
Total	190	94	9	293
English and Speech				
Doctor's	9	4	2	15
Master's	20	0	0	20
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	29	4	2	35
Entomology				
Doctor's	0	5	1	6
Master's	0	2	0	2
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	0	7	1	8
Evaluation Services				
Doctor's	8	0	2	10
Master's	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	8	0	2	10
Field Services				
Doctor's	1	0	0	1
Master's	2	0	0	2
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	3	0	0	3
Fine Arts				
Doctor's	0	5	0	5
Master's	3	7	0	10
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	3	12	0	15

Table 48, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Foreign Studies				
Doctor's	0	14	0	14
Master's	1	2	1	4
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	1	16	1	18
French				
Doctor's	1	5	0	6
Master's	8	1	0	9
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	10	6	0	16
Forestry and Natural Resources				
Doctor's	3	24	4	31
Master's	6	10	1	17
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	9	34	5	48
General Education				
Doctor's	3	0	0	3
Master's	12	0	0	12
Bachelor's	6	0	0	6
Total	21	0	0	21
Geography				
Doctor's	5	15	2	22
Master's	14	5	0	19
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	19	20	2	41
Geology				
Doctor's	3	29	2	34
Master's	4	2	0	6
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	8	31	2	41
German				
Doctor's	6	19	0	25
Master's	1	1	0	2
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	8	20	0	28

Table 48, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
History				
Doctor's	12	55	0	67
Master's	9	2	0	11
Bachelor's	2	1	0	3
Total	23	58	0	81
Home Economics				
Doctor's	1	6	4	11
Master's	44	23	2	69
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	46	29	6	81
Hotel Admn.				
Doctor's	0	2	1	3
Master's	3	3	0	6
Bachelor's	5	0	0	5
Total	8	5	1	14
Humanities				
Doctor's	24	4	0	28
Master's	3	0	0	3
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	28	4	0	32
Industrial Arts				
Doctor's	2	2	0	4
Master's	21	3	0	24
Bachelor's	2	0	0	2
Total	25	5	0	30
Industrial Tech.				
Doctor's	2	5	0	7
Master's	16	3	0	19
Bachelor's	13	0	0	13
Total	31	8	0	39
Journalism				
Doctor's	0	4	2	7
Master's	3	7	1	11
Bachelor's	4	10	0	14
Total	7	21	3	31

Table 48, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Laboratory School				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	70	0	1	71
Bachelor's	19	0	0	19
Total	89	0	1	90
Languages, Modern and Foreign				
Doctor's	24	33	2	59
Master's	36	3	0	39
Bachelor's	4	0	0	4
Total	64	36	2	102
Law				
Doctor's	0	0	1	1
Master's	5	2	15	22
Bachelor's	3	2	29	34
Total	8	4	45	57
Library Science				
Doctor's	0	2	1	3
Master's	5	5	2	12
Bachelor's	0	0	1	1
Total	5	7	4	16
Mathematics and Statistics				
Doctor's	18	118	2	138
Master's	79	4	0	83
Bachelor's	32	2	0	34
Total	129	124	2	255
Medicine				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's	0	6	5	11
Total	0	6	5	11
Music				
Doctor's	8	29	3	40
Master's	57	58	1	116
Bachelor's	5	11	0	16
Total	70	98	4	172

Table 48, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Mortuary Science				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	2	0	0	2
Bachelor's	3	0	0	3
Total	5	0	0	5
Natural Science				
Doctor's	29	0	0	29
Master's	11	1	0	12
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	41	1	0	42
Nursing				
Doctor's	0	0	1	1
Master's	24	12	2	38
Bachelor's	7	1	0	8
Total	31	13	3	47
Occupational Therapy				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	2	3	0	5
Bachelor's	3	1	0	4
Total	5	4	0	9
Pharmacy				
Doctor's	8	9	1	18
Master's	5	0	1	6
Bachelor's	6	0	0	6
Total	19	9	2	30
Philosophy				
Doctor's	4	21	0	25
Master's	8	1	0	9
Bachelor's	0	2	0	2
Total	12	24	0	36
Physical Education				
Doctor's	12	10	1	23
Master's	90	25	2	117
Bachelor's	39	0	0	39
Total	141	35	3	179
Physical Science				
Doctor's	2	4	0	6
Master's	3	1	0	4
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	6	5	0	11

Table 48, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Physics				
Doctor's	19	55	6	80
Master's	38	7	0	45
Bachelor's	19	0	0	19
Total	76	62	6	144
Physics and Chemistry				
Doctor's	3	2	0	5
Master's	4	0	0	4
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	7	2	0	9
Police Administration				
Doctor's	0	2	0	2
Master's	2	1	0	3
Bachelor's	4	1	0	5
Total	6	4	0	10
Political Science				
Doctor's	6	60	2	68
Master's	9	4	0	13
Bachelor's	0	2	0	2
Total	15	66	2	83
Psychology				
Doctor's	9	62	20	91
Master's	17	3	2	22
Bachelor's	4	1	0	5
Total	30	66	22	118
Psychology and Education				
Doctor's	12	15	0	27
Master's	34	3	0	37
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	47	18	0	65
Religion, Theology				
Doctor's	0	1	1	2
Master's	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	1	2
Slavic				
Doctor's	1	8	0	9
Master's	0	1	0	1
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	1	9	0	10

Table 48, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Sociology and Anthropology				
Doctor's	1	26	0	27
Master's	10	2	0	12
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	11	28	0	39
Sociology				
Doctor's	4	20	6	30
Master's	5	2	0	7
Bachelor's	0	1	0	1
Total	9	23	6	38
Social Sciences				
Doctor's	46	13	1	60
Master's	25	1	0	26
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	72	14	1	87
Social Work				
Doctor's	0	4	5	9
Master's	2	9	14	25
Bachelor's	0	0	2	2
Total	2	13	21	36
Spanish				
Doctor's	0	6	0	6
Master's	5	1	0	6
Bachelor's	2	0	0	2
Total	7	7	0	14
Speech and Drama				
Doctor's	12	51	3	66
Master's	47	26	1	74
Bachelor's	4	0	0	4
Total	63	77	4	144
Unclassified, Graduate School				
Doctor's	0	0	1	1
Master's	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	1	1

Table 48, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Veterinary Medicine				
Doctor's	0	17	1	18
Master's	1	7	0	8
Bachelor's	1	1	0	2
Total	2	25	1	28
Zoology				
Doctor's	4	34	2	40
Master's	1	2	0	3
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	5	36	2	43
All Subject-areas Combined:				
Doctor's, Number	550	1,479	181	2,210
Per Cent of Level	23.7	67.8	61.4	46.0
Master's, Number	1,395	605	73	2,073
Per Cent of Level	60.0	27.7	24.7	43.2
Bachelor's, Number	379	97	41	517
Per Cent of Level	16.3	4.4	13.9	10.8
Total Number	2,324	2,181	295	4,800

Table 49. Number of Faculty Members Having Each Highest Degree Earned for Each Level of Instructional Service in Each Subject-area in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Anthropology				
Doctor's	0	2	0	2
Master's	1	0	0	1
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	1	2	0	3
Architecture				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	0	0	1	1
Bachelor's	2	0	0	2
Total	2	0	1	3
Art and Design				
Doctor's	1	1	0	2
Master's	15	6	1	22
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	16	7	1	24
Biology				
Doctor's	13	6	0	19
Master's	24	2	0	26
Bachelor's	10	0	0	10
Total	47	8	0	55
Biological Science				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	1	0	0	1
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	0	1
Business Administration				
Doctor's	4	6	0	10
Master's	58	15	4	77
Bachelor's	83	7	3	93
Total	145	28	7	180
Chemistry				
Doctor's	21	6	1	28
Master's	18	1	0	19
Bachelor's	22	0	0	22
Total	61	7	1	69

Table 49, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Classics				
Doctor's	2	0	0	2
Master's	4	0	0	4
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	7	0	0	7
Economics				
Doctor's	11	6	1	18
Master's	24	3	0	27
Bachelor's	12	0	0	12
Total	47	9	1	57
Education				
Doctor's	16	6	1	23
Master's	40	12	1	53
Bachelor's	4	0	0	4
Total	60	18	2	80
Engineering, All Types				
Doctor's	3	3	0	6
Master's	90	2	0	92
Bachelor's	90	1	0	91
Total	183	6	0	189
Aeronautical Engr.				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	1	0	0	1
Bachelor's	2	0	0	2
Total	3	0	0	3
Architectural Engr.				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	4	0	0	4
Bachelor's	2	0	0	2
Total	6	0	0	6
Chemical Engr.				
Doctor's	0	2	0	2
Master's	1	2	0	3
Bachelor's	3	0	0	3
Total	4	4	0	8
Civil and Sanitary Engr.				
Doctor's	1	1	0	2
Master's	6	0	0	6
Bachelor's	6	0	0	6
Total	13	1	0	14

Table 49, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Electrical Engr.				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	7	0	0	7
Bachelor's	11	0	0	11
Total	18	0	0	18
General Engineering				
Doctor's	2	0	0	2
Master's	20	0	0	20
Bachelor's	41	1	0	42
Total	63	1	0	64
Industrial Engr.				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	10	0	0	10
Bachelor's	15	0	0	15
Total	25	0	0	25
Mechanical Engr.				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	16	0	0	16
Bachelor's	9	0	0	9
Total	25	0	0	25
Engineering Mechanics				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	25	0	0	25
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	26	0	0	26
English				
Doctor's	36	6	0	42
Master's	104	6	0	110
Bachelor's	26	0	0	26
Total	166	12	0	178
Fine Arts				
Doctor's	0	1	0	1
Master's	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	0	1
French				
Doctor's	6	0	0	6
Master's	5	0	0	5
Bachelor's	1	0	0	1
Total	12	0	0	12

Table 49, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
German				
Doctor's	2	0	0	2
Master's	5	0	0	5
Bachelor's	2	0	0	2
Total	9	0	0	9
Greek				
Doctor's	2	0	0	2
Master's	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's	3	0	0	3
Total	5	0	0	5
History				
Doctor's	18	4	0	22
Master's	18	1	0	19
Bachelor's	5	0	0	5
Total	41	5	0	46
Home Economics				
Doctor's	2	0	0	2
Master's	12	1	0	13
Bachelor's	3	0	0	3
Total	17	1	0	18
Humanities				
Doctor's	5	0	0	5
Master's	8	0	0	8
Bachelor's	8	0	0	8
Total	21	0	0	21
Industrial Technology				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	13	0	0	13
Bachelor's	46	0	0	46
Total	59	0	0	59
Journalism				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	6	3	0	9
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	6	3	0	9
Language, Modern and Foreign				
Doctor's	14	2	0	16
Master's	24	2	0	26
Bachelor's	2	1	0	3
Total	40	5	0	45

Table 49, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Latin				
Doctor's	2	0	0	2
Master's	7	0	0	7
Bachelor's	3	0	0	3
Total	12	0	0	12
Law				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	6	0	2	8
Bachelor's	25	2	3	30
Total	31	2	5	38
Library Science				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	4	0	0	4
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	4	0	0	4
Mathematics and Statistics				
Doctor's	10	5	0	15
Master's	36	3	0	39
Bachelor's	25	0	0	25
Total	71	8	0	79
Music				
Doctor's	5	0	0	5
Master's	61	3	0	64
Bachelor's	24	0	0	24
Total	90	3	0	93
Philosophy				
Doctor's	14	8	0	22
Master's	14	0	0	14
Bachelor's	3	0	0	3
Total	31	8	0	39
Physical Education				
Doctor's	1	0	0	1
Master's	32	1	0	33
Bachelor's	16	0	0	16
Total	49	1	0	50
Physics				
Doctor's	8	4	0	12
Master's	16	0	0	16
Bachelor's	6	0	0	6
Total	30	4	0	34

Table 49, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Political Science				
Doctor's	2	4	0	6
Master's	9	2	0	11
Bachelor's	3	0	0	3
Total	14	6	0	20
Psychology				
Doctor's	20	15	2	37
Master's	17	6	1	24
Bachelor's	9	0	0	9
Total	46	21	3	70
Psychology and Education				
Doctor's	2	0	0	2
Master's	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	2	0	0	2
Religion, Theology				
Doctor's	27	3	5	35
Master's	27	2	1	30
Bachelor's	9	1	2	12
Total	63	6	8	77
Science and Mathematics				
Doctor's	3	0	0	3
Master's	19	0	0	19
Bachelor's	23	1	0	24
Total	45	1	0	46
Social Sciences				
Doctor's	2	0	0	2
Master's	10	0	0	10
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	12	0	0	12
Social Work				
Doctor's	2	0	0	2
Master's	0	3	0	3
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	2	3	0	5
Sociology				
Doctor's	10	6	0	16
Master's	16	3	0	19
Bachelor's	4	1	0	5
Total	30	10	0	40

Table 49, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only	Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	Graduate Level Only	Total
Spanish				
Doctor's	3	0	0	3
Master's	[illegible]	0	0	4
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0
Total	7	0	0	7
Speech and Drama				
Doctor's	4	0	0	4
Master's	30	1	0	31
Bachelor's	3	1	0	4
Total	37	2	0	39
Unclassified, Graduate School				
Doctor's	0	0	0	0
Master's	0	0	5	5
Bachelor's	0	0	1	1
Total	0	0	6	6
All Subject-areas Combined:				
Doctor's, Number	271	94	10	375
Per Cent of Level	17.8	50.3	28.6	21.5
Master's, Number	778	78	16	872
Per Cent of Level	51.1	41.7	45.7	50.0
Bachelor's, Number	473	15	9	497
Per Cent of Level	31.1	8.0	25.7	28.5
Total Number	1,522	187	35	1,744

Table 50. Number of Faculty Members Having Each Highest Degree Earned, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of Community Colleges, Fall 1957.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only
Agriculture	
Doctor's	0
Master's	1
Bachelor's	0
Total	1
Anatomy	
Doctor's	0
Master's	0
Bachelor's	1
Total	1
Art and Design	
Doctor's	1
Master's	15
Bachelor's	5
Total	21
Biology	
Doctor's	1
Master's	12
Bachelor's	1
Total	14
Biological Science	
Doctor's	1
Master's	5
Bachelor's	0
Total	6
Botany	
Doctor's	0
Master's	1
Bachelor's	0
Total	1
Business Administration	
Doctor's	1
Master's	61
Bachelor's	10
Total	72
Chemistry	
Doctor's	2
Master's	22
Bachelor's	2
Total	26

Table 50, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only
Communication Skills	
Doctor's	0
Master's	1
Bachelor's	0
Total	1
Economics	
Doctor's	0
Master's	6
Bachelor's	0
Total	6
Education	
Doctor's	0
Master's	3
Bachelor's	1
Total	4
Engineering, All Types	
Doctor's	0
Master's	24
Bachelor's	6
Total	30
Electrical Engineering	
Doctor's	0
Master's	1
Bachelor's	1
Total	2
General Engineering	
Doctor's	0
Master's	21
Bachelor's	5
Total	26
Mechanical Engineering	
Doctor's	0
Master's	1
Bachelor's	0
Total	1
Metallurgical Engineering	
Doctor's	0
Master's	1
Bachelor's	0
Total	1

Table 50, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only
English	
Doctor's	3
Master's	112
Bachelor's	5
Total	120
French	
Doctor's	0
Master's	4
Bachelor's	0
Total	4
Geology	
Doctor's	0
Master's	1
Bachelor's	0
Total	1
German	
Doctor's	0
Master's	4
Bachelor's	0
Total	4
History	
Doctor's	2
Master's	14
Bachelor's	1
Total	17
Home Economics	
Doctor's	0
Master's	4
Bachelor's	2
Total	6
Humanities	
Doctor's	1
Master's	1
Bachelor's	0
Total	2
Industrial Arts	
Doctor's	0
Master's	5
Bachelor's	4
Total	9

Table 50, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only
Industrial Technology	
Doctor's	0
Master's	21
Bachelor's	18
Total	39
Journalism	
Doctor's	0
Master's	0
Bachelor's	1
Total	1
Languages, Modern and Foreign	
Doctor's	0
Master's	8
Bachelor's	0
Total	8
Library Science	
Doctor's	0
Master's	1
Bachelor's	0
Total	1
Mathematics and Physics	
Doctor's	0
Master's	2
Bachelor's	0
Total	2
Mathematics and Statistics	
Doctor's	1
Master's	48
Bachelor's	13
Total	62
Medicine	
Doctor's	0
Master's	6
Bachelor's	0
Total	6
Music	
Doctor's	0
Master's	13
Bachelor's	2
Total	15

Table 50, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level Only
Natural Science	
Doctor's	0
Master's	4
Bachelor's	0
Total	4
Nursing	
Doctor's	0
Master's	11
Bachelor's	7
Total	18
Philosophy	
Doctor's	0
Master's	2
Bachelor's	0
Total	2
Physical Education	
Doctor's	0
Master's	19
Bachelor's	9
Total	28
Physical Science	
Doctor's	0
Master's	3
Bachelor's	0
Total	3
Physics	
Doctor's	0
Master's	8
Bachelor's	4
Total	12
Physics and Chemistry	
Doctor's	0
Master's	1
Bachelor's	0
Total	1
Political Science	
Doctor's	0
Master's	10
Bachelor's	1
Total	11

Table 50, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level
Psychology	
Doctor's	0
Master's	8
Bachelor's	2
Total	10
Psychology and Education	
Doctor's	5
Master's	1
Bachelor's	0
Total	6
Science and Mathematics	
Doctor's	10
Master's	39
Bachelor's	9
Total	58
Social Sciences	
Doctor's	7
Master's	37
Bachelor's	4
Total	48
Sociology	
Doctor's	0
Master's	5
Bachelor's	0
Total	5
Spanish	
Doctor's	1
Master's	1
Bachelor's	1
Total	3
Speech and Drama	
Doctor's	0
Master's	8
Bachelor's	2
Total	10

Table 50, Continued.

Subject-area and Degree Held	Undergraduate Level
Zoology	
Doctor's	2
Master's	2
Bachelor's	0
Total	4
All Subject-areas Combined:	
Doctor's, Number	38
Per Cent	5.4
Master's, Number	554
Per Cent	78.8
Bachelor's, Number	111
Per Cent	15.8
Total Number	703

Table 51. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members at Each Level of Teaching Service Holding Certain Academic Ranks, for the Groups of State-controlled and Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Institution	Undergraduate Level Only				Undergraduate and Graduate Levels				Graduate Level Only			
	Professor and Associate Professor		Assistant Professor and Instructor		Professor and Associate Professor		Assistant Professor and Instructor		Professor and Associate Professor		Assistant Professor and Instructor	
	Number	% of Total at This Level	Number	% of Total at This Level	Number	% of Total at This Level	Number	% of Total at This Level	Number	% of Total at This Level	Number	% of Total at This Level
State-controlled	417	21.9	1,491	78.1	1,246	62.7	752	37.3	198	78.9	53	21.1
Privately Controlled	445	50.5	882	49.5	75	49.0	78	51.0	12	60.0	8	40.0
Totals	862	26.6	2,373	73.4	1,321	61.4	830	38.6	210	77.5	61	22.5

Table 52. Number of Faculty Members at Each Academic Rank and Level of Instructional Service, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Agriculture						
Undergraduate	3	6	14	9	4	36
Undergraduate and Graduate	34	43	18	1	1	97
Graduate	5	1	3	0	0	9
Total	42	50	35	10	5	142
Anatomy						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	1	2	3
Undergraduate and Graduate	3	1	2	0	0	6
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	1	2	1	2	9
Anthropology						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	5	1	0	0	8
Graduate	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	3	5	1	0	0	9
Architecture						
Undergraduate	7	7	21	11	0	46
Undergraduate and Graduate	6	2	4	3	0	15
Graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	15	9	25	14	0	63
Art and Design						
Undergraduate	2	4	10	10	7	33
Undergraduate and Graduate	4	11	17	0	4	36
Graduate	1	0	1	0	0	2
Total	7	15	28	10	11	71
Astronomy						
Undergraduate	0	2	1	0	0	3
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2
Graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	4	2	1	0	0	7
Bacteriology						
Undergraduate	0	0	1	0	0	1
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	1	0	0	1

Table 52, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Biology						
Undergraduate	5	5	10	8	1	29
Undergraduate and Graduate	7	3	12	1	0	23
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	12	8	22	9	1	52
Biological Science						
Undergraduate	1	0	7	2	1	11
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	1	0	0	0	3
Graduate	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	4	1	7	2	1	15
Botany						
Undergraduate	1	1	2	1	4	9
Undergraduate and Graduate	9	14	9	0	2	34
Graduate	2	2	0	0	0	4
Total	12	17	11	1	6	47
Business Administration						
Undergraduate	7	21	43	41	36	148
Undergraduate and Graduate	38	38	24	11	22	133
Graduate	2	4	2	1	0	9
Total	47	63	69	53	58	290
Chemistry						
Undergraduate	4	7	14	11	23	59
Undergraduate and Graduate	21	16	20	5	3	65
Graduate	1	3	1	0	0	5
Total	26	26	35	16	26	129
Chemistry and Chem. Engr.						
Undergraduate	0	0	4	0	0	4
Undergraduate and Graduate	5	2	3	0	0	10
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	2	7	0	0	14
Classics						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	4	4
Undergraduate and Graduate	5	2	0	2	0	9
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	2	0	2	4	13
Communication Skills						
Undergraduate	2	8	28	25	0	63
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	1	0	0	0	1
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	9	28	25	0	64

Table 52, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Economics						
Undergraduate	0	2	12	18	12	44
Undergraduate and Graduate	18	12	14	2	3	49
Graduate	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	19	14	26	20	15	94
Education						
Undergraduate	4	4	34	55	38	135
Undergraduate and Graduate	50	53	54	13	80	250
Graduate	21	14	12	1	16	64
Total	75	71	100	69	134	449
Engineering, All Types						
Undergraduate	30	32	54	101	40	257
Undergraduate and Graduate	90	81	43	12	29	255
Graduate	10	2	3	2	6	23
Total	130	115	100	115	75	535
Aeronautical Engineering						
Undergraduate	2	1	1	1	2	7
Undergraduate and Graduate	4	7	4	2	2	19
Graduate	1	0	2	0	0	3
Total	7	8	7	3	4	29
Chemical Engineering						
Undergraduate	3	2	4	5	2	16
Undergraduate and Graduate	16	7	7	3	3	36
Graduate	4	0	0	0	1	5
Total	33	9	11	8	6	67
Civil and Sanitary Engr.						
Undergraduate	1	0	4	8	7	20
Undergraduate and Graduate	17	18	4	3	2	44
Graduate	1	0	1	1	2	5
Total	19	18	9	12	11	69
Electrical Engineering						
Undergraduate	7	5	11	28	11	62
Undergraduate and Graduate	12	13	6	1	4	36
Graduate	3	2	0	1	1	7
Total	22	20	17	30	16	105
General Engineering						
Undergraduate	4	7	7	7	3	28
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	1	0	0	1	4
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	8	7	7	4	32

Table 52, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Geological Engineering						
Undergraduate	2	0	1	1	0	4
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	1	0	0	0	3
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	1	1	1	0	7
Industrial Engineering						
Undergraduate	0	0	1	0	1	2
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	4	1	1	5	11
Graduate	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	1	4	2	1	6	14
Mechanical Engineering						
Undergraduate	7	14	20	33	10	84
Undergraduate and Graduate	22	10	14	1	11	58
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	29	24	34	34	21	142
Engineering Mechanics						
Undergraduate	2	1	5	15	4	27
Undergraduate and Graduate	6	13	4	1	1	25
Graduate	0	0	0	0	2	2
Total	8	14	9	16	7	54
Metallurgical Engineering						
Undergraduate	0	1	0	1	0	2
Undergraduate and Graduate	4	6	2	0	0	12
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	7	2	1	0	14
Mining Engineering						
Undergraduate	2	1	0	2	0	5
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	1	0	2	0	7
Naval and Marine Engineering						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undergraduate and Graduate	3	1	1	0	0	5
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	1	1	0	0	5
English						
Undergraduate	14	20	50	69	37	190
Undergraduate and Graduate	31	25	25	9	4	94
Graduate	8	1	0	0	0	9
Total	53	46	75	78	41	293

Table 52, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
English and Speech						
Undergraduate	2	5	12	10	0	29
Undergraduate and Graduate	4	0	0	0	0	4
Graduate	1	1	0	0	0	2
Total	7	6	12	10	0	35
Entomology						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undergraduate and Graduate	1	1	4	1	0	7
Graduate	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	2	1	4	1	0	8
Evaluation Services						
Undergraduate	2	2	2	2	0	8
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	1	1	0	0	0	2
Total	3	3	2	2	0	10
Field Services						
Undergraduate	0	0	3	0	0	3
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	3	0	0	3
Fine Arts						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	2	1	3
Undergraduate and Graduate	4	3	2	3	0	12
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	3	2	5	1	15
Foreign Studies						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	1	0	1
Undergraduate and Graduate	3	6	5	2	0	16
Graduate	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	3	6	5	4	0	18
French						
Undergraduate	0	1	1	0	8	10
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	2	1	1	0	6
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	3	2	1	8	16
Forestry and Natural Resource						
Undergraduate	2	2	4	1	0	9
Undergraduate and Graduate	9	12	10	2	1	34
Graduate	3	2	0	0	0	5
Total	14	16	14	3	1	48

Table 52, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
General Education						
Undergraduate	0	3	8	2	8	21
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	3	8	2	8	21
Geography						
Undergraduate	1	3	8	6	1	19
Undergraduate and Graduate	5	5	4	4	2	20
Graduate	1	1	0	0	0	2
Total	7	9	12	10	3	41
Geology						
Undergraduate	1	1	3	3	0	8
Undergraduate and Graduate	15	7	5	2	2	31
Graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	18	8	8	5	2	41
German						
Undergraduate	0	0	2	5	1	8
Undergraduate and Graduate	8	5	2	5	0	20
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8	5	4	10	1	28
History						
Undergraduate	2	2	8	9	2	23
Undergraduate and Graduate	23	17	15	4	0	59
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	25	19	23	13	2	82
Home Economics						
Undergraduate	2	7	11	24	2	46
Undergraduate and Graduate	5	9	9	4	2	29
Graduate	3	0	2	0	1	6
Total	10	16	22	28	5	81
Hotel Administration						
Undergraduate	2	1	1	3	1	8
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	1	3	1	0	5
Graduate	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	3	2	4	4	1	14
Humanities						
Undergraduate	3	2	14	8	1	28
Undergraduate and Graduate	1	2	1	0	0	4
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	4	15	8	1	32

Table 52, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Industrial Arts						
Undergraduate	2	7	14	2	0	25
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	2	1	0	0	5
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	9	15	2	0	30
Industrial Technology						
Undergraduate	1	3	13	3	23	43
Undergraduate and Graduate	1	4	1	0	2	8
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	7	14	3	25	51
Journalism						
Undergraduate	1	0	0	4	2	7
Undergraduate and Graduate	6	7	5	3	1	22
Graduate	1	1	1	0	0	3
Total	8	8	6	7	3	32
Laboratory School						
Undergraduate	0	4	66	19	0	89
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	1	0	0	1
Total	0	4	67	19	0	90
Languages, Modern and Foreign						
Undergraduate	2	8	21	26	9	66
Undergraduate and Graduate	12	14	8	1	1	36
Graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	16	22	29	27	10	104
Law						
Undergraduate	1	2	2	0	3	8
Undergraduate and Graduate	3	0	0	0	1	4
Graduate	28	5	3	4	5	45
Total	32	7	5	4	9	57
Library Science						
Undergraduate	0	0	4	1	0	5
Undergraduate and Graduate	1	4	0	1	1	7
Graduate	1	0	2	1	0	4
Total	2	4	6	3	1	16
Mathematics and Statistics						
Undergraduate	8	10	29	40	50	137
Undergraduate and Graduate	36	27	47	13	1	124
Graduate	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	46	37	76	53	51	263

Table 52, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Medicine						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	6	6
Graduate	0	0	0	0	5	5
Total	0	0	0	0	11	11
Mortuary Science						
Undergraduate	0	0	2	0	4	6
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	2	0	4	6
Music						
Undergraduate	4	10	30	18	10	72
Undergraduate and Graduate	28	27	29	19	6	109
Graduate	3	0	1	0	0	4
Total	35	37	60	37	16	185
Natural Science						
Undergraduate	4	2	18	17	0	41
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	1	0	1
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	2	18	18	0	42
Nursing						
Undergraduate	1	3	9	15	3	31
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	4	4	3	2	13
Graduate	1	1	0	0	1	3
Total	2	8	13	18	6	47
Occupational Therapy						
Undergraduate	0	0	3	0	2	5
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	1	0	3	4
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	4	0	5	9
Pharmacy						
Undergraduate	2	5	4	1	7	19
Undergraduate and Graduate	4	1	4	0	0	9
Graduate	0	1	0	1	0	2
Total	6	7	8	2	7	30
Philosophy						
Undergraduate	0	2	0	6	4	12
Undergraduate and Graduate	9	4	6	5	0	24
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9	6	6	11	4	36

Table 52, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Physical Education						
Undergraduate	11	26	53	35	17	142
Undergraduate and Graduate	8	15	6	0	6	35
Graduate	1	1	0	0	1	3
Total	20	42	59	35	24	180
Physical Science						
Undergraduate	2	0	1	1	2	6
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	1	2	0	0	5
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	1	3	1	2	11
Physics						
Undergraduate	1	4	18	13	40	76
Undergraduate and Graduate	19	15	25	0	3	62
Graduate	4	2	0	0	0	6
Total	24	21	43	13	43	144
Physics and Chemistry						
Undergraduate	1	3	2	1	0	7
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	2	0	0	0	2
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	5	2	1	0	9
Police Administration						
Undergraduate	0	3	1	1	1	6
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	1	1	0	0	4
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	4	2	1	1	10
Political Science						
Undergraduate	0	1	5	7	2	15
Undergraduate and Graduate	19	13	21	10	3	66
Graduate	1	0	1	0	0	2
Total	20	14	27	17	5	83
Psychology						
Undergraduate	0	0	2	14	14	30
Undergraduate and Graduate	13	19	23	9	2	66
Graduate	8	7	2	1	4	22
Total	21	26	27	24	20	118
Psychology and Education						
Undergraduate	3	4	36	4	0	47
Undergraduate and Graduate	8	7	3	0	0	18
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	11	11	39	4	0	65

Table 52, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Religion and Theology						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	1	0	0	1
Graduate	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	1	0	1	0	0	2
Slavic						
Undergraduate	1	0	0	0	0	1
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	2	3	3	1	9
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	2	3	3	1	10
Social Sciences						
Undergraduate	8	16	32	15	1	72
Undergraduate and Graduate	6	3	4	1	0	14
Graduate	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	14	20	36	16	1	87
Social Work						
Undergraduate	0	0	1	0	1	2
Undergraduate and Graduate	1	7	3	0	2	13
Graduate	7	6	4	0	4	21
Total	8	13	8	0	7	36
Sociology						
Undergraduate	0	1	1	3	4	9
Undergraduate and Graduate	4	9	5	4	1	23
Graduate	5	0	1	0	0	6
Total	9	10	7	7	5	38
Sociology and Anthropology						
Undergraduate	0	0	1	2	8	11
Undergraduate and Graduate	6	4	15	2	1	28
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	4	16	4	9	39
Spanish						
Undergraduate	0	0	1	1	5	7
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	4	1	0	0	7
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	4	2	1	5	14
Speech and Drama						
Undergraduate	3	2	18	28	12	63
Undergraduate and Graduate	17	19	24	13	5	78
Graduate	4	0	0	0	0	4
Total	24	21	42	41	17	145

Table 52, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Unclassified, Graduate School						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	0	0	0	0	1	1
Veterinary Medicine						
Undergraduate	0	0	1	1	0	2
Undergraduate and Graduate	9	4	6	6	0	25
Graduate	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	10	4	7	7	0	28
Zoology						
Undergraduate	0	0	2	3	0	5
Undergraduate and Graduate	11	11	9	5	0	36
Graduate	1	0	0	1	0	2
Total	12	11	11	9	0	43
All Subject-areas Combined:						
Undergraduate						
Number	153	264	772	719	458	2,366
Per Cent of Level	6.5	11.2	32.6	30.4	19.4	
Undergraduate and Graduate						
Number	636	610	565	187	203	2,201
Per Cent of Level	28.9	27.8	25.7	8.5	9.2	
Graduate						
Number	141	57	40	13	44	295
Per Cent of Level	47.8	19.3	13.6	4.4	14.9	
Total - Number	930	931	1,377	919	705	4,862
Per Cent	19.1	19.1	28.3	18.9	14.5	

Table 53. Number of Faculty Members at Each Academic Rank and Level of Instructional Service, in Each Subject-area, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Anthropology						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	1	0	1
Undergraduate and Graduate	1	1	0	0	0	2
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	1	0	1	0	3
Architecture						
Undergraduate	0	0	1	1	0	2
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	0	0	1	1	1	3
Art and Design						
Undergraduate	3	5	3	4	1	16
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	1	0	3	5	9
Graduate	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	3	6	3	7	7	26
Biology						
Undergraduate	7	11	13	8	8	47
Undergraduate and Graduate	3	0	5	0	0	8
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	10	11	18	8	8	55
Biological Science						
Undergraduate	1	0	0	0	0	1
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	0	0	0	1
Business Administration						
Undergraduate	5	11	37	38	59	150
Undergraduate and Graduate	4	3	6	3	12	28
Graduate	0	0	0	0	8	8
Total	9	14	43	41	79	186
Chemistry						
Undergraduate	12	6	11	15	18	62
Undergraduate and Graduate	3	2	2	0	0	7
Graduate	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	15	8	13	15	19	70

Table 53, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Classics						
Undergraduate	2	1	1	3	0	7
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	1	1	3	0	7
Economics						
Undergraduate	4	9	10	11	13	47
Undergraduate and Graduate	3	2	1	1	2	9
Graduate	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	7	11	11	12	16	57
Education						
Undergraduate	14	5	12	16	13	60
Undergraduate and Graduate	3	1	2	2	10	18
Graduate	0	0	1	0	1	2
Total	17	6	15	18	24	80
Engineering, All Types						
Undergraduate	17	17	54	88	12	188
Undergraduate and Graduate	3	2	0	0	1	6
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	20	19	54	88	13	194
Aeronautical Engineering						
Undergraduate	0	0	2	1	0	3
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	2	1	0	3
Architectural Engineering						
Undergraduate	2	0	2	4	0	8
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	0	2	4	0	8
Chemical Engineering						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	2	2	4
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	1	0	0	1	4
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	1	0	2	3	8
Civil and Sanitary Engineering						
Undergraduate	1	2	4	6	0	13
Undergraduate and Graduate	1	0	0	0	0	1
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	2	4	6	0	14

Table 53, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Electrical Engineering						
Undergraduate	4	0	3	10	1	18
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	0	3	10	1	18
General Engineering						
Undergraduate	2	3	14	43	2	64
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	1	0	0	0	1
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	4	14	43	2	65
Industrial Engineering						
Undergraduate	1	6	15	4	0	26
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	6	15	4	0	26
Mechanical Engineering						
Undergraduate	3	2	5	9	6	25
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	2	5	9	6	25
Engineering Mechanics						
Undergraduate	4	4	9	9	1	27
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	4	9	9	1	27
English						
Undergraduate	19	20	52	48	29	168
Undergraduate and Graduate	4	3	4	1	0	12
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	23	23	56	49	29	180
Fine Arts						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	1	0	0	0	1
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	0	0	0	1
French						
Undergraduate	6	0	4	1	1	12
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	0	4	1	1	12

Table 53, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
German						
Undergraduate	1	4	0	4	2	11
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	4	0	4	2	11
Greek						
Undergraduate	1	0	1	1	2	5
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	1	1	2	5
History						
Undergraduate	11	10	8	10	2	41
Undergraduate and Graduate	1	1	3	0	0	5
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	12	11	11	10	2	46
Home Economics						
Undergraduate	3	6	1	6	1	17
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	1	1	2
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	6	1	7	2	19
Humanities						
Undergraduate	3	2	6	9	2	22
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	2	6	9	2	22
Industrial Technology						
Undergraduate	3	15	27	29	0	74
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	15	27	29	0	74
Journalism						
Undergraduate	3	0	1	1	1	6
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	1	0	1	1	3
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	1	1	2	2	9
Languages, Modern and Foreign						
Undergraduate	6	9	13	9	3	40
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	1	2	1	1	5
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	10	15	10	4	45

Table 53, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Latin						
Undergraduate	5	3	1	2	2	13
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	3	1	2	2	13
Law						
Undergraduate	5	0	2	1	23	31
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	1	1	2
Graduate	0	1	0	1	3	5
Total	5	1	2	3	27	38
Library Science						
Undergraduate	0	1	1	2	0	4
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	1	2	0	4
Mathematics and Statistics						
Undergraduate	10	4	13	33	13	73
Undergraduate and Graduate	4	0	3	1	0	8
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	14	4	16	34	13	81
Music						
Undergraduate	12	13	17	55	3	100
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	5	0	5
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	12	13	17	60	3	105
Philosophy						
Undergraduate	11	4	5	6	5	31
Undergraduate and Graduate	3	1	2	2	0	8
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	14	5	7	8	5	39
Physical Education						
Undergraduate	4	6	14	22	4	50
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	1	0	0	0	1
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	7	14	22	4	51
Physics						
Undergraduate	6	5	8	8	3	30
Undergraduate and Graduate	1	2	1	0	0	4
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	7	7	9	8	3	34

Table 53, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Political Science						
Undergraduate	1	4	1	4	4	14
Undergraduate and Graduate	1	0	2	2	1	6
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	4	3	6	5	20
Psychology						
Undergraduate	10	7	10	10	10	47
Undergraduate and Graduate	3	6	9	1	2	21
Graduate	0	2	1	0	0	3
Total	13	15	20	11	12	71
Psychology and Education						
Undergraduate	1	0	1	0	0	2
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	1	0	0	2
Religion, Theology						
Undergraduate	22	15	11	13	4	65
Undergraduate and Graduate	2	0	2	1	1	6
Graduate	6	1	0	1	0	8
Total	30	16	13	15	5	79
Science and Mathematics						
Undergraduate	3	7	23	14	0	47
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	1	0	1
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	7	23	15	0	48
Social Sciences						
Undergraduate	4	4	2	1	1	12
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	4	2	1	1	12
Social Work						
Undergraduate	1	0	0	0	1	2
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	2	1	0	3
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	2	1	1	5
Sociology						
Undergraduate	5	7	4	12	2	30
Undergraduate and Graduate	4	2	1	2	1	10
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9	9	5	14	3	40

Table 53, Continued.

Subject-area and Level of Instruction	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total
Spanish						
Undergraduate	4	0	0	3	[illegible]	7
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	0	0	3	0	7
Speech and Drama						
Undergraduate	5	4	11	14	3	37
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	1	1	0	0	2
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	5	12	14	3	39
Unclassified, Graduate School						
Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undergraduate and Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	0	2	4	0	0	6
Total	0	2	4	0	0	6
All Subject-areas Combined:						
Undergraduate						
Number	230	215	379	503	245	1,572
Per Cent of Level	14.6	13.7	24.1	32.0	15.6	
Undergraduate and Graduate						
Number	43	32	48	30	39	192
Per Cent of Level	22.4	16.7	25.0	15.6	20.3	
Graduate						
Number	6	6	6	2	16	36
Per Cent of Level	16.7	16.7	16.7	5.6	44.4	
Total: Number	279	253	433	535	300	1,800
Per Cent	15.5	14.1	24.1	29.7	16.7	

undergraduate courses only is higher in the privately controlled institutions than in the State-controlled ones. This would arise quite naturally from the fact that the academic ranks in most of the privately controlled institutions pertain to faculty members teaching undergraduate classes only, while in several of the State-controlled institutions, the academic ranks for a given institution may include undergraduate and graduate faculties. In other words, an institution with undergraduate work only, will have the ranks distributed only within this level, whereas the institution with undergraduate and graduate faculty, will have its academic ranks distributed over these levels combined. With the variability due to this factor, and the obvious variations in the qualifications for academic ranks which probably exist in the individual institutions, the data of these tables should be interpreted with care and attention to the preceding discussion of highest degree held.

Teaching Level and Years of Service at Present Institution

An analysis was made of the relationship of years of service at the institution of present employment and the instructional level of assignment. These data are summarized in Tables 54 and 55. No such table was prepared for the community colleges because only undergraduate work is taught in these institutions.

For the State-controlled institutions, Table 54 indicates a definite relationship between years of service and the level of teaching assignment. Thus, of the 1,486 faculty members with ten years or more of service, 36 per cent were assigned undergraduate teaching only, while of the 3,381 faculty members with less than ten years of service, 55 per cent were assigned undergraduate level courses only. The percentage columns show gradual decreases at the undergraduate level only, especially during the first three years of service, and increases at the graduate level only and the undergraduate and graduate levels combined.

Table 54. Distribution of Faculty Members According to Years of Service and Level of Instruction, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Years of Service	Undergraduate Only		Graduate Only		Undergraduate and Graduate		Total Number
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	
0	698	74.2	27	2.9	216	22.9	941
1	415	60.9	29	4.2	238	34.9	682
2	253	52.9	27	5.7	198	41.4	478
3	125	48.8	10	3.9	121	47.3	256
4	88	39.1	23	10.2	114	50.7	225
5	56	33.1	19	11.3	94	55.6	169
6-7	94	34.7	25	9.2	152	56.1	271
8-9	122	32.2	30	7.9	227	59.9	379
10-14	269	37.9	48	6.8	393	55.3	710
15-19	70	30.6	16	7.0	143	62.4	229
20-24	40	26.7	16	10.7	94	62.6	150
25-29	63	34.2	14	7.6	107	58.2	184
30-34	51	40.2	5	3.9	71	55.9	127
35 & over	41	47.7	7	8.1	38	44.2	86
Totals	2,385	48.8	296	6.1	2,206	45.1	4,887

Table 55. Distribution of Faculty Members According to Years of Service and Level of Instruction, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Years of Service	Undergraduate Only		Graduate Only		Undergraduate and Graduate		Total Number
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	
0	207	88.5	7	3.0	20	8.5	234
1	344	93.0	4	1.1	22	5.9	370
2	163	90.1	4	2.2	14	7.7	181
3	110	88.7	2	1.6	12	9.7	124
4	96	81.4	3	2.5	19	16.1	118
5	73	81.1	4	4.4	13	14.5	90
6-7	108	86.4	2	1.6	15	12.0	125
8-9	102	82.9	2	1.6	19	15.5	123
10-14	264	84.9	5	1.6	42	13.5	311
15-19	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
20-24	37	80.4	0	0.0	9	19.6	46
25-29	39	79.6	3	6.1	7	14.3	49
30-34	36	90.0	0	0.0	4	10.0	40
35 & over	14	93.3	0	0.0	1	6.7	15
Totals	1,593	87.2	36	2.0	197	10.8	1,826

The progression is marked for only the first five years of service, especially for undergraduate only and graduate only. For undergraduate and graduate combined, the progression continues upward to 20 years of service, and then, curiously, declines. There is much that might be suggested in the interpretation of these trends, but it would be largely speculation, for data were not gathered that would warrant a further interpretation.

CHAPTER VI

SALARIES PAID TO FACULTY MEMBERS

Salary Basis

Institutions utilize three basic contractual arrangements in the employment of personnel. Probably the most usual arrangement is the contract for the academic year, usually extending from September to June. Under this arrangement, the faculty member is then free to accept employment at his own institution or at another for teaching or research during the intervening months.

The employment of faculty members on the basis of an 11-month contract is less common. This type of contract calls for the employment of the faculty member for the entire year, with usually one month off for vacation, with the understanding that the institution will utilize his services throughout the year. With current discussions of year-round classes in colleges and universities, this type of contract arrangement may well increase in popularity.

The third type of arrangement is the part-time contract. The use of part-time faculty by an institution will vary due to several factors. First, there are the specific kinds of needs resulting from the character and extent of the institutional curriculum. It is certainly more economical for an institution to employ a part-time faculty member, who is properly qualified, if it plans to offer some single specialized course for which it does not have adequate staff available. It is, likewise, more economical to employ just a part-time person to teach one or two extra sections of a course, rather than employ a full-time person, for whom, under these circumstances, there would not be a full-time assignment available.

Second, it will depend upon the availability of part-time individuals who possess the particular training and skill to provide needed teaching services. The location of an institution is another factor. Institutions, such as Wayne State University and the University of Detroit, located in or near a metropolitan area, will find an unusually rich source of competent teaching personnel who can be employed on a part-time basis. Such opportunities are definitely limited for institutions located in small cities, or cities at some distance from metropolitan areas.

From Tables 56, 57, and 58, which summarize data on type of employment contract in the individual colleges and universities of Michigan, it is evident that fairly extensive use is made of part-time teaching faculties in all three types of institutions. Of the 7,395 faculty members on whom data were received, 1,611, or 21.8 per cent, were part-time in the fall of 1957. In the State-controlled institutions 19.2 per cent were part-time, in the privately controlled institutions, 27.9 per cent were part-time, and in the community colleges, 24.3 per cent were part-time. In the State-controlled institutions, Wayne State University reported the largest percentage of part-time staff members, which, as was pointed out above, reflects the use being made of competent and qualified individuals in the Detroit area who are available to do such part-time work. The University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Ferris Institute employ the next largest percentages of part-time instructional staffs.

Large percentages of part-time faculty are to be found in some of the community colleges. One contributing factor is that in several of these institutions, teachers are used jointly by the community college and the local high school. Another factor is that in some of the community colleges only limited programs are available in certain areas, for which only part-time staff are employed. The largest percentages

Table 56. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each State-controlled Institution on Each Type of Salary Contract, Fall 1957.

Institution	Salary Basis						Number of Faculty Reported
	10-month Contract		11-month Contract		Part-time		
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	
Central Michigan College	210	94.6	10	4.5	2	0.9	222
Eastern Michigan College	290	94.2	0	0.0	18	5.8	308
Ferris Institute	80	64.0	28	22.4	17	13.6	125
Michigan College of M&T (Houghton)	132	81.5	17	10.5	13	8.0	162
Michigan College of M&T (Sault Br.)	32	97.0	1	3.0	0	0.0	33
Michigan State University	850	60.4	353	25.1	205	14.6	1,408
Northern Michigan College	70	98.6	1	1.4	0	0.0	71
University of Michigan	922	78.3	25	2.1	231	19.6	1,178
Wayne State University	599	54.7	44	4.0	452	41.3	1,095
Western Michigan University	281	96.6	9	3.1	1	0.3	291
Totals	3,466	70.8	488	10.0	939	19.2	4,893

Table 57. Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Privately Controlled Institution on Each Type of Salary Contract, Fall 1957.

Institution	Salary Basis		
	10-month Contract	11-month Contract	Part-time
	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent
P-1	77.4	0.0	22.6
P-2	84.5	4.8	10.7
P-3	93.8	0.0	6.2
P-5	66.7	3.9	29.4
P-10	0.0	38.5	61.5
P-11	7.1	57.2	35.7
P-12	15.8	15.8	68.4
P-16	83.8	1.0	15.2
P-18	19.0	0.0	81.0
P-21	10.9	16.4	72.7
P-27	80.0	6.7	13.3
P-31	0.0	100.0	0.0
P-34	0.0	100.0	0.0
P-36	59.6	36.2	4.2
P-38	19.0	0.0	81.0
P-39	82.4	3.9	13.7
P-40	9.1	40.9	50.0
P-41	85.7	0.0	14.3
P-42	69.7	27.3	3.0
P-43	36.2	25.5	38.3
P-48	8.0	80.0	12.0
P-50	82.1	3.6	14.3
P-52	86.6	6.7	6.7
P-54	0.0	100.0	0.0
P-56	100.0	0.0	0.0
P-57	96.4	0.0	3.6
P-59	36.9	10.5	52.6
P-60	33.8	32.9	33.3
P-61	92.3	7.7	0.0
P-62	0.0	100.0	0.0
Totals	43.1	29.0	27.9

Table 58. Number and Percentage of Faculty Members in Each Community College on Each Type of Salary Contract, Fall 1957.

Institution	Salary Basis						Number of Faculty Reported
	10-month Contract		11-month Contract		Part-time		
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	
Alpena	19	90.5	0	0.0	2	9.5	21
Battle Creek	9	69.2	0	0.0	4	30.8	13
Bay City	43	51.2	3	3.6	38	45.2	84
Benton Harbor	19	82.6	4	17.4	0	0.0	23
Flint	109	62.6	21	12.1	44	25.3	174
Gogebic	6	35.3	0	0.0	11	64.7	17
Grand Rapids	41	50.6	19	23.5	21	25.9	81
Henry Ford	63	74.1	19	22.4	3	3.5	85
Highland Park	58	98.3	1	1.7	0	0.0	59
Jackson	27	55.1	2	4.1	20	40.8	49
Lansing	3	27.3	0	0.0	8	72.7	11
Muskegon	26	74.3	2	5.7	7	20.0	35
Northwestern	15	68.2	4	18.2	3	13.6	22
Port Huron	25	83.4	4	13.3	1	3.3	30
South Macomb	5	26.3	0	0.0	14	73.7	19
Totals	468	64.7	79	10.9	176	24.3	723

of faculty on part-time occur at Lansing Community College, South Macomb Community College, Muskegon Community College, Gogebic Community College, and Bay City Junior College.

There is considerable variation in the percentages of faculty employed on the basis of the 11-month contract. In the State-controlled institutions as a group, 10 per cent of the reported faculty are on an 11-month contract, with Michigan State University and Ferris Institute showing the two highest percentages, 25.1 per cent and 22.4 per cent, respectively. In the community colleges, the percentage is similar, being 10.9. The two community colleges with the highest percentage of faculty on an 11-month contract are Grand Rapids Junior College and Henry Ford Community College with 23.5 and 22.4 per cent, respectively. The percentage of instructional staff on an 11-month contract as reported in the privately controlled institutions is much higher than in either of the other two types of institutions. The privately controlled institutions, as a group, show 29.0 per cent of their instructional staff on an 11-month contract. Most of the 516 11-month contract instructional staff reported by the privately controlled institutions is accounted for by two institutions, one of which employs its entire staff on this basis, while the other employs over 30 per cent in this manner.

One of the compelling reasons in favor of employing faculty on the basis of an 11-month contract is the increasing use which is made of institutional faculty members on a year-round basis. The fact of the matter is that a rather large percentage of institutional faculties are involved in teaching summer sessions, for which they receive additional pay. The division here arises from the fact that in most institutions, as a matter of tradition, the summer session is considered to be a "self-sustaining" enterprise, that is salaries for summer session faculties are paid from summer session income. At such time as the summer term becomes an integral part of the total school year, which it inevitably must, the merging of the summer term and "regular terms" into one budgetary unit will be a most natural process. The result will be the use of an increasing number of faculty members on an 11-month basis. At such times as this becomes a reality, attention must be given to the provision of sufficient faculty time for research, advanced study, etc.

Average Salaries

It is inevitable that the whole question of procurement and retention of capable and qualified faculty in our colleges and universities resolves itself to a consideration of financial support for salaries commensurate with the contributions of college teachers to the welfare of our society. The fact of the matter is, as practically every piece of research on this topic during the past decade will show, the average salaries being paid to our college and university faculties, are not only below those paid in professions such as law and medicine, but the purchasing power of these salaries has fallen far behind that of the Nation as a whole.

These facts and their implications for the quality and availability of higher education to our young people are critical. Fortunately, these facts, which are being brought forcibly to the public's attention, are being recognized by increasing numbers of people -- philanthropic donors, business, industry, the federal government, and State legislators. The fact is that, if education is to survive and continue making its vital impact upon American society, it will take monumental efforts by the entire Nation, especially in the area of financial support for faculty salaries.

These conditions, reflecting the national situation, apply in every respect to the State of Michigan, which in the past has fostered and vigorously supported an outstanding program of higher education. The colleges and universities of the State -- both private and public -- must obtain such financial support as will enable them to improve faculty salaries to a point where they can compete with other professions and business and industry for the most talented and capable individuals. Again, to be specific, the attainment of the favorable position the teaching profession had prior to the war in terms of relative purchasing power, would require an average increase in faculty salaries of over 70 per cent, immediately and over 100 per cent by 1970.[1] These are disturbing statistics, but they must be faced realistically if higher education is to flourish and fulfill its purposes in the State of Michigan and the Nation.

The data on average salaries paid to full-time instructional faculty, on 10-month contracts only, in the individual colleges and universities of Michigan are given in Tables 59, 60, and 61. For institutions reporting data on at least 25 faculty members, the standard deviation has been computed, and for the publicly controlled institutions, the number of faculty at each institution is also given in the tables.

According to Table 59, the 3,464 instructional faculty members reported as being on 10-month contracts in the State-controlled institutions were receiving an average salary of $7,386 for the academic year, with a standard deviation of $2,214. The University of Michigan stands out far above the other State-controlled institutions in Michigan, with an average faculty salary of $8,508. Wayne State University is second with an average faculty salary of $7,408, more than $1,000 below the average at the University of Michigan. Third and fourth in rank order

---

[1] Second Report to the President, The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, July 1957, Washington, D.C., p.5.

Table 59. Average Faculty Salary and the Standard Deviation of the Distribution of Salaries in Each State-controlled Institution, Fall 1957, (10-month Basis).

Institution	Average Salary	Standard Deviation	Number of Faculty Reported
Central Michigan College	$6,887	$1,082	210
Eastern Michigan College	6,576	1,349	290
Ferris Institute	6,351	776	80
Michigan College of Mining and Technology (Houghton)	6,677	1,229	132
Michigan College of Mining and Technology (Sault Branch)	5,897	870	32
Michigan State University	6,926	1,605	849
Northern Michigan College	6,873	1,434	70
University of Michigan	8,508	3,097	922
Wayne State University	7,476	2,068	598
Western Michigan University	7,036	1,091	281
Averages	$7,386	$2,214	3,464

Table 60. Average Faculty Salary and the Standard Deviation of the Distribution of Salaries in Each Privately Controlled Institution, Fall 1957 (10-month Basis).

Institution	Average Salary	Standard Deviation
P-18	$7,625	$ -
P-39	6,363	1,192
P-42	6,351	1,189
P-38	6,302	991
P-16	5,798	1,036
P-3	5,260	679
P-41	5,131	-
P-57	5,000	-
P-21	4,877	-
P-43	4,823	-
P-5	4,652	547
P-1	4,608	364
P-59	4,400	-
P-50	4,265	786
P-12	3,683	-
P-60	3,626	1,855
P-61	3,162	-
P-52	*	
P-56	*	
Averages	$4,643	$1,815

*Data for these institutions are omitted because the averages were incredibly low.

Table 61. Average Faculty Salary and the Standard Deviation of the Distribution of Salaries in Each Community College, Fall 1957 (10-month Basis).

Institution	Average Salary	Standard Deviation	Number of Faculty Reported
Alpena Community College	$5,889	$ -	19
Battle Creek Community College	4,887	-	9
Bay City Junior College	6,026	952	43
Benton Harbor Community College	5,931	-	19
Flint Junior College	6,479	673	109
Gogebic Community College	5,534	-	6
Grand Rapids Junior College	6,237	1,210	39
Henry Ford Community College	6,778	964	63
Highland Park Junior College	6,712	1,140	58
Jackson Junior College	6,092	662	27
Lansing Community College	5,467	-	3
Muskegon Community College	5,627	1,462	26
Northwestern Michigan College	5,415	-	15
Port Huron Junior College	5,383	710	24
South Macomb Community College	6,712	-	5
Averages	$6,232	$1,051	465

are Western Michigan University with an average faculty salary of $7,036 and Michigan State University with $6,926. The Branch of Michigan College of Mining and Technology at Sault Ste. Marie has the lowest average faculty salary of only $5,897, but only a junior college program is offered there. The averages for the other institutions fall within a normal range, from $6,351 at Ferris Institute to $6,887 at Central Michigan College.

The State-controlled institutions vary, in several instances, on the size of the standard deviation. The standard deviation of $3,097 at the University of Michigan is the largest, reflecting a wide spread of salaries paid at that institution. This statistic would indicate that approximately two-thirds of the salaries of the 10-month, full-time faculty at the University of Michigan fall in the range from $5,411 to $11,605. Wayne State University, also, has a rather large standard deviation of $2,068.

In the consideration of the average salaries paid in the privately controlled institutions, it should be kept in mind that, for the purposes of this study, those faculty members who were reported as having part or all of their salary on a "contributed services" basis, were omitted from the calculations, even though a number of the institutions submitted a hypothetical salary for such faculty members. The average salary for the faculty members in the privately controlled institutions as a group is $4,643 with a standard deviation of $1,815. Thus, approximately two-thirds of the faculty members in these institutions receive salaries ranging from $2,828 to $6,458. Eleven of the privately controlled institutions show averages which are above the average for these institutions as a group. The average faculty salary for those institutions in the group which are accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is just $400 higher than the average for the group of unaccredited, private institutions.

The average faculty salary in the community colleges of Michigan is $6,232, with a standard deviation of $1,051, indicating that approximately two-thirds of the faculty members in these institutions receive salaries ranging between $5,181 and $7,283. Five of the fifteen community colleges have averages above the average of the group. They are Flint Junior College, Grand Rapids Junior College, Henry Ford Community College, Highland Park Junior College, and South Macomb Community College.

Except for four or five instances among the privately controlled institutions, the results of these tabular summaries are reason for deep concern regarding the faculty salary situations in this group of institutions. The average salaries of faculty in State-controlled institutions are generally below averages for similar institutions throughout the country. Add this factor to the already startling difference in the average for the privately controlled institutions as a group and the respective averages for the State-controlled institutions and the community colleges, and one is abruptly brought to a realization that the welfare of privately financed education is in serious jeopardy if these conditions are permitted to prevail much longer. The difference between the average for the State-controlled institutions and the privately controlled institutions is $2,725, and the difference between the average salary paid in community colleges and that paid in privately controlled institutions is $1,589. Even taking into consideration the effect of higher salaries paid at the graduate level (a further discussion of this is given later), one can only conclude that prompt action is required to raise the salary levels in almost all the privately controlled institutions. It is self-evident that to simply bring the averages up to the level of those in the community colleges represents nothing less than a monumental effort on the part of constituencies of privately controlled institutions -- alumni, church groups, philanthropic donors, business, and industry. There is certainly general agreement on the desirability of fostering a strong and vigorous program in privately supported higher education. The facts, as presented in this study, point to the necessity of translating into action these verbalized agreements on this fundamental principle.

The data on the total group of college and university faculty for whom salary data are reported in Tables 59, 60, and 61, show that the average salary paid to the 4,464 individuals in this group was $6,937. When consideration is given to the number of years of educational preparation required for college teaching and the average salaries paid in other professions with similar educational requirements, it is clear that, on the average, college and university faculty salaries in Michigan will have to be increased to maintain the qualitative levels of faculty which have prevailed in Michigan in the past. The relative position of the average college and university faculty salary in the State of Michigan is highlighted even more when compared to the fact that during 1957 the average family income in the United States (as reported in the May 17, 1958 issue of Business Week, p.166) was $6,130. On the basis of data presented by the U. S. Department of Commerce, the average faculty salary of $6,937 in Michigan would mean that this average faculty salary is better than just 62 per cent of the families in the country. This is not at all commensurate with the economic status the teaching profession ought to occupy in our country. It is recognized that the comparison being made here is between 10-month faculty salaries and 12-month family incomes.

Salary Distributions

A slightly different presentation of data on faculty salaries is given in Table 62. In this table, the distribution of salaries paid in the three types of institutions in Michigan is presented in terms of the number of faculty members receiving salary amounts within the given interval. Also included in the table are the cumulative percentages for each type of institution. It should be noted that these tabular summaries are for full-time faculty members on a 10-month contract at the institutions. It does not include those faculty who are employed on a "contributed services" basis.

The salaries range from the lowest interval used in the calculations, less than $3,000, to a high of $9,500-9,999 in the community colleges and privately controlled institutions, and a high of over $15,000 in the State-controlled institutions. The most useful comparison in this table can be made by considering the cumulative percentage columns for each of the three types of institutions. Thus, for the State-controlled institutions, 53.8 per cent of the individual salaries are above $6,800; in the community colleges, 56.7 per cent of the salaries are above $6,200; while in the privately controlled institutions, 49.7 per cent of the salaries are above only $5,000. These three figures, $6,800 for the State-controlled institutions, $6,200 for the community colleges, and $5,000 for the privately controlled institutions, represent, approximately the median salaries paid in each type of institution, that is, an equal number of salaries paid are found on either side of these values. The cumulative percentages for all three types of institutions combined show that the median salary paid to faculty in Michigan colleges and universities, during 1957, was between $6,600 and $6,799.

These statistics underscore again the conclusion drawn earlier, that, in light of the salaries paid in other professions requiring the same kind of educational

Table 62. Distribution of Faculty Salaries in Each of the Three Types of Institutions, Fall 1957, 10-month Salary Basis.

Salary Interval	State-controlled Institutions		Privately Controlled Institutions		Community Colleges		Totals	
	No. in Each Interval	Cumulative Per Cent	No. in Each Interval	Cumulative Per Cent	No. in Each Interval	Cumulative Per Cent	No. in Each Interval	Cumulative Per Cent
$15,000-over	42	1.2					42	0.9
14,000-14,999	18	1.7					18	1.3
13,000-13,999	35	2.7					35	2.1
12,000-12,999	51	4.2					51	3.3
11,000-11,999	118	7.6					118	5.9
10,000-10,999	139	11.6					139	9.0
9,500-9,999	113	14.9	1	0.2	1	0.2	115	11.6
9,000-9,499	185	20.2	1	0.4	0	0.2	186	15.8
8,500-8,999	142	24.3	3	0.9	0	0.2	145	19.0
8,000-8,499	216	30.6	4	1.7	8	1.9	228	24.1
7,500-7,999	263	38.2	16	4.7	52	13.2	331	31.6
7,000-7,499	375	49.0	19	8.2	43	22.5	437	41.4
6,800-6,999	167	53.8	7	9.5	28	28.6	202	45.9
6,600-6,799	152	58.2	15	12.3	37	36.6	204	5[illegible]
6,400-6,599	138	62.2	15	15.1	40	45.2	193	54.8
6,200-6,399	148	66.5	8	16.6	53	56.7	209	59.5
6,000-6,199	214	72.6	18	20.0	30	63.2	262	65.3
5,800-5,999	153	77.0	19	23.6	31	69.9	203	69.9
5,600-5,799	146	81.3	16	26.5	19	74.0	181	74.0
5,400-5,599	178	86.4	34	32.9	27	79.9	239	79.3
5,200-5,399	123	90.0	36	39.6	26	85.5	185	83.5
5,000-5,199	138	93.9	54	49.7	21	90.0	213	88.2
4,800-4,999	74	96.1	33	55.9	17	93.7	124	91.0
4,600-4,799	29	96.9	33	62.1	11	96.1	73	92.6
4,400-4,599	30	97.8	42	70.0	10	98.3	82	94.5
4,200-4,399	48	99.2	23	74.2	6	99.6	77	96.2
4,000-4,199	8	99.4	21	78.1	0	99.6	29	96.9
3,800-3,999	2	99.5	4	78.9	0	99.6	6	97.0
3,600-3,799	4	99.6	6	80.0	0	99.6	10	97.2
3,400-3,599	0	99.6	8	81.5	1	99.8	9	97.4
3,200-3,399	5	99.7	3	82.1	0	99.8	8	97.6
3,000-3,199	3	99.8	2	82.4	0	99.8	5	97.7
Less than 3,000	7	100.0	94	100.0	1	100.0	101	100.0
Totals	3,464		535		462		4,461	

preparation as for college teaching, these salaries are well below the point which will make it possible for Michigan institutions to continue to compete successfully in the procurement of qualified instructional staff. It should be noted that less than 10 per cent of the faculty reported in this table have salaries above $10,000. Compare this with the fact that during 1957 slightly over 10 per cent of the Nation's families earned over $10,000 per year. This again focuses attention on the fact that faculty salary levels and distributions do not represent the kind of educational preparation required to enter the college-teaching field. This table further emphasizes the critical problem faced by most of the privately controlled institutions in the State of Michigan. The constituencies of these institutions could well take note of the very low medians, averages, and ranges of salaries in the privately controlled institutions.

Salary and Academic Rank

For the State-controlled institutions and the privately controlled institutions, in which academic ranks are used, analyses were made of salary distributions and averages for each of the ranks. Tables 63 and 64 present the data on average faculty salaries by academic ranks in the two types of institutions, for each of the individual institutions.

The average salary paid to full professors in the State-controlled institutions is $10,509 with only two institutions, University of Michigan and Wayne State University, having averages above the average for the group. Michigan State University has the third highest average with $9,681. The lowest average salary paid to full professors is at Ferris Institute, with $7,658.

The average salary paid to associate professors in the State-controlled institutions as a group is $7,997, with the University of Michigan and Wayne State

Table 63. Average Faculty Salary for Each Academic Rank in Each State-controlled Institution, Fall 1957, 10-month Salary Basis.

Institution	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total All Ranks
Central Michigan College	$8,368	$7,333	$6,496	$5,160	$ -	$6,887
Eastern Michigan College	8,919	7,510	6,194	5,102	-	6,576
Ferris Institute	7,658	6,939	6,276	5,253	5,883	6,351
Michigan College of M&T (Houghton)	8,336	7,528	6,392	5,213	3,600	6,677
Michigan College of M&T (Sault Branch)	-	7,188	6,084	4,933	-	5,897
Michigan State University	9,681	7,950	6,504	5,338	6,984	6,926
Northern Michigan College	8,778	7,259	6,029	4,900	-	6,873
University of Michigan	11,895	8,368	6,621	5,083	6,172	8,508
Wayne State University	10,350	8,432	6,620	5,101	6,144	7,476
Western Michigan University	8,470	7,428	6,283	5,252	8,813	7,036
Totals	$10,509	$7,997	$6,443	$5,192	$6,872	$7,386
Five Selected State Universities*	$10,593	$7,717	$6,275	$5,076	-	$7,637

*Bulletin, American Association of University Professors, Vol. 44, No. 1A, Spring 1958, pp.237-69.

Table 64. Average Faculty Salary for Each Academic Rank in Each Privately Controlled Institution, Fall 1957, 10-month Salary Basis.

Institution	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total All Ranks
P-1	$4,575	$4,825	$4,467	$4,230	$ -	$4,608
P-3	5,603	5,283	4,958	4,950	4,700	5,260
P-5	5,400	5,060	4,930	4,189	-	4,653
P-12	-	-	-	-	3,683	3,683
P-16	7,115	6,407	5,751	4,871	5,053	5,798
P-18	7,625	-	-	-	-	7,625
P-21	5,000	5,270	4,573	-	-	4,877
P-38	7,206	6,375	5,880	5,220	-	6,302
P-39	7,412	7,087	5,636	4,998	-	6,363
P-41	5,300	5,407	5,250	4,738	-	5,131
P-42	9,700	7,354	6,040	5,900	-	6,351
P-43	5,175	4,700	4,657	-	-	4,823
P-50	4,000	4,200	4,400	4,380	-	4,265
P-52*						
P-56*						
P-57	-	5,000	-	-	-	5,000
P-59	-	4,800	4,600	4,280	-	4,400
P-60	6,300	-	5,369	4,430	1,417	3,603
P-61	-	3,492	2,833	-	-	3,163
Totals	$6,100	$5,143	$4,972	$4,406	$1,675	$4,643

*Data omitted because the averages were unusually low.

University being the only two institutions with averages above this. The average salary paid to assistant professors in the State-controlled institutions is $6,443, with four of the institutions having an average above that. These institutions are, in rank order, University of Michigan, Wayne State University, Michigan State University, and Central Michigan College. The average paid to instructors varies within a rather narrow range, from a low of $4,900 at Northern Michigan College to a high of $5,338 at Michigan State University.

For the privately controlled institutions, the averages for each of the ranks are markedly lower than the averages for the corresponding ranks in the State-controlled institutions. Also, there appear to be wider variations in the averages among the privately controlled institutions than in the State-controlled ones. Except for the two institutions in which the data are subject to question, the average salary paid to full professors in the privately controlled institutions is $6,100 with a range from $4,000 to $9,700; the average paid to associate professors is $5,143, with a range from $3,492 to $7,354; the average paid to assistant professors is $4,972, with a range from $2,833 to $6,040; and the average paid to instructors is $4,406, with a range from $4,189 to $5,900.

Aside from the fact that average faculty salaries in the privately controlled institutions are lower than those in the State-controlled institutions, one other criticism can be made of the salary averages for the group of privately controlled institutions, and that is, that, with two or three exceptions, the differentials from one rank to another do not represent large enough increments to be realistically associated with differences in academic ranks.

For purposes of comparison, data are presented in Table 63 on average salaries paid to faculty in five selected State universities in the country. These data are taken from the Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, Volume

44, No. 1A, Spring 1958, pages 237-269. These five institutions are selected by the Association on the basis of geographical representation and because they are institutions which represent good institutional salary policies. The American Association of University Professors Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession, which prepared these statistics, goes on to point out, however, that despite what appear to be substantial gains made in salary increases in these institutions, the purchasing power of the college and university faculty member still remains below the 1939 level, whereas the purchasing power in other professions has continued to rise with the economy.

Thus, from Table 63, it might appear that the State-controlled institutions in Michigan compare very favorably on the average salary for all ranks combined. An examination of the averages in individual institutions reveals the fact that only one Michigan institution, the University of Michigan, has an average which is above that for the 5 selected universities. Generally similar conclusions are reached upon examination of the average salaries in the individual ranks. For full professors, only at the University of Michigan does the average exceed that of the five institutions; for associate professors, three institutions, the University of Michigan, Wayne State University, and Michigan State University exceed the average of the five; for the rank of assistant professor, seven of the Michigan institutions exceed the average for the five; and for the level of instructor, eight of the Michigan institutions exceed the average for the group of five.

There is an important conclusion to be drawn from the above comparisons. By and large, the Michigan, State-controlled institutions exceed the averages of the five selected State universities at the lower ranks of instructor and assistant professor, but the opposite is true of the two upper ranks, especially the rank of professor. If the colleges and universities of Michigan are to obtain and retain outstanding faculty members for teaching and research, whose qualifications would be reflected in advancement to ranks of professor and associate professor, they must be supported, financially, in order that they can be in a competitive position with institutions such as are represented in the group of five universities. This would mean about a 10 per cent increase just to equal present salaries paid at these levels by out-of-state institutions. If, as is anticipated, these five institutions grant salary increases next year, it will mean that a much higher increase will be necessary in Michigan in order to attain a favorable competitive position.

Tabular presentations are made of the percentage distributions of faculty salaries by rank. In Tables 65 and 66, data are presented showing, by given intervals of salary, the cumulative percentages of faculty in each rank who receive salaries in these intervals. It is evident again that there is a distinct difference between the privately controlled institutions and the State-controlled ones in the ranges of salaries and their concentration toward the lower level. Comparisons of the intervals containing the approximate medians for each rank also bring out the distinct difference. In the State-controlled institutions, the medians, in other words, the point on either side of which are found an equal number of cases, are approximately as follows: professor - $10,000, associate professor - $8,000, assistant professor - $6,400, and instructor - $5,200. In the privately controlled institutions, the medians are approximately as follows: professor - $6,400, associate professor - $5,400, assistant professor - $5,200, and instructor - $4,600. These tables point up again the fact that in the privately controlled institutions the range of salaries from rank to rank is not large enough.

Table 65. Cumulative Percentage Distributions of Faculty Salaries for Each Academic Rank in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis).

Salary Interval	Cumulative Percentages			
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor
$15,000 and over	5.7			
14,000-14,999	8.1	0.1		
13,000-13,999	12.7	0.4		
12,000-12,999	19.5	0.4	0.1	
11,000-11,999	35.6	0.7	0.2	
10,000-10,999	53.6	1.7	0.3	
9,500-9,999	66.7	3.5	0.4	
9,000-9,499	78.6	16.1	0.4	
8,500-8,999	87.1	26.0	0.6	
8,000-8,499	93.2	45.9	1.6	
7,500-7,999	97.4	71.4	3.8	0.1
7,000-7,499	98.8	91.0	20.5	1.2
6,800-6,999	99.1	95.0	31.3	1.3
6,600-6,799	99.2	98.2	41.3	1.9
6,400-6,599	99.3	98.8	51.2	2.8
6,200-6,399	99.3	99.1	62.1	4.7
6,000-6,199	99.3	99.2	77.9	7.1
5,800-5,999	99.3	99.5	87.5	11.8
5,600-5,799	99.3	99.5	95.0	19.4
5,400-5,599	99.6	99.5	98.8	37.5
5,200-5,399	99.6	99.6	99.4	53.6
5,000-5,199	99.6	99.6	99.5	72.7
4,800-4,999	99.6	99.6	99.6	83.0
4,600-4,799	99.6	99.6	99.8	86.6
4,400-4,599	99.6	99.6	99.8	90.9
4,200-4,399	99.6	99.6	99.8	97.8
4,000-4,199	99.6	99.6	99.8	98.7
3,800-3,999	99.6	99.6	99.8	99.0
3,600-3,799	99.6	99.7	99.8	99.1
3,400-3,599	99.6	99.7	99.8	99.1
3,200-3,399	99.6	99.7	100.1	99.2
3,000-3,199	99.6	99.8	100.1	99.3
Less than 3,000	100.0	100.0	100.1	99.9

Table 66. Cumulative Percentage Distributions of Faculty Salaries for Each Academic Rank in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis).

Salary Interval	Cumulative Percentages			
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor
$9,500-9,999	1.1			
9,000-9,499	1.1	1.3		
8,500-8,999	3.3	2.6		
8,000-8,499	6.5	3.9		
7,500-7,999	20.5	7.8		
7,000-7,499	32.3	17.0		
6,800-6,999	37.7	18.3	0.6	
6,600-6,799	43.1	24.9	2.5	0.7
6,400-6,599	50.6	30.2	5.0	0.7
6,200-6,399	53.8	34.1	6.2	0.7
6,000-6,199	58.1	39.4	11.8	1.4
5,800-5,999	60.3	43.3	19.9	2.1
5,600-5,799	61.4	45.9	26.8	3.5
5,400-5,599	66.8	49.8	40.6	6.3
5,200-5,399	67.9	52.4	52.5	16.2
5,000-5,199	81.9	61.6	65.0	26.1
4,800-4,999	87.3	68.2	70.0	36.7
4,600-4,799	87.3	74.8	75.0	50.2
4,400-4,599	93.7	76.1	83.1	65.8
4,200-4,399	93.7	77.4	88.1	75.7
4,000-4,199	96.9	78.7	90.0	85.6
3,800-3,999	96.9	78.7	90.6	87.0
3,600-3,799	96.9	80.0	90.6	89.8
3,400-3,599	98.0	85.3	91.2	89.8
3,200-3,399	98.0	86.6	91.2	90.5
3,000-3,199	98.0	86.6	91.2	91.9
Less than 3,000	100.2	99.8	99.4	99.7

Tables 67 and 68 show percentage distributions of faculty salaries in State-controlled and privately controlled institutions, with the percentage in each rank of the total number of faculty in the salary interval. These tables demonstrate, in considerable detail, the close relationship between academic rank and salary of faculty members.

Salaries and Sex of Faculty Members

In a preceding section a comparison was made of the percentage of women and men holding the various academic ranks. It was pointed out that in the State-controlled institutions, the opportunities for women to be appointed to the two upper academic ranks, especially that of full professor, were considerably less than for the men. In the present section, an analysis is made of the comparative salaries paid to men and women at the four academic ranks. Tables 69 and 70 summarize these comparisons for the State-controlled and privately controlled institutions in Michigan. Since academic ranks are not used in the community colleges, Table 71 shows only average salaries for men and women in these institutions.

In the State-controlled institutions, for all ranks combined, the average salary paid to women faculty members is $1,072 less than the average paid to men in this group of institutions. The largest difference occurs at the level of professor, with lesser differences at the associate professor's rank and at the instructor's rank. The average salary at the rank of assistant professor is the same for women and for men.

In the privately controlled institutions the average salary paid to men faculty is just $246 more than the average paid to women. In this group of institutions, as in the State-controlled ones, the largest difference occurs at

Table 67. Percentage of Faculty Ranks for Each Salary Level in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis).

Salary Interval	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total Number in Salary Interval
$15,000 and over	97.6				2.4	42
14,000-14,999	94.4	5.6				18
13,000-13,999	94.3	5.7				35
12,000-12,999	96.0		2.0		2.0	51
11,000-11,999	97.5	1.7	0.8			118
10,000-10,999	92.8	5.8	0.7		0.7	139
9,500-9,999	93.2	12.4	0.9		3.5	113
9,000-9,499	45.9	53.0			1.1	185
8,500-8,999	43.0	54.2	1.4		1.4	142
8,000-8,499	20.4	71.3	5.5		2.8	216
7,500-7,999	11.4	75.3	10.2	0.4	2.7	263
7,000-7,499	2.7	40.5	53.9	2.1	0.8	375
6,800-6,999	1.2	18.6	78.4	0.6	1.2	167
6,600-6,799	0.7	16.4	79.6	2.6	0.7	152
6,400-6,599	0.7	3.6	86.9	4.4	4.4	138
6,200-6,399		1.3	89.2	8.8	0.7	148
6,000-6,199		0.5	89.7	7.9	1.9	214
5,800-5,999		1.3	76.5	21.6	0.6	153
5,600-5,799			62.3	36.3	1.4	146
5,400-5,599	1.1		25.8	71.4	1.7	178
5,200-5,399		0.8	5.7	91.9	1.6	123
5,000-5,199			0.7	97.1	2.2	138
4,800-4,999			1.4	97.2	1.4	74
4,600-4,799			6.9	86.2	6.9	29
4,400-4,599				100.0		30
4,200-4,399				100.0		48
4,000-4,199				75.0	25.0	8
3,800-3,999				100.0		2
3,600-3,799		25.0		25.0	50.0	4
3,400-3,599						0
3,200-3,399			80.0	20.0		5
3,000-3,199		33.3		33.3	33.3	3
2,800-2,999	28.6			57.1	14.3	7

Table 68. Percentage of Faculty Ranks for Each Salary Level in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis).

Salary Interval	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Other	Total Number in Salary Interval
$9,500-9,999	100.0					1
9,000-9,499		100.0				1
8,500-8,999	66.7	33.3				3
8,000-8,499	75.0	25.0				4
7,500-7,999	81.2	18.8				16
7,000-7,499	57.9	36.8			5.3	19
6,800-6,999	71.4	14.3	14.3			7
6,600-6,799	33.3	33.3	20.0	6.7	6.7	15
6,400-6,599	46.6	26.7	26.7			15
6,200-6,399	37.5	37.5	25.0			8
6,000-6,199	22.2	22.2	50.0	5.6		18
5,800-5,999	10.5	15.8	68.4	5.3		19
5,600-5,799	6.2	12.5	68.8	12.5		16
5,400-5,599	14.7	8.8	64.7	11.8		34
5,200-5,399	2.8	5.5	52.8	38.9		36
5,000-5,199	24.1	13.0	37.0	25.9		54
4,800-4,999	15.2	15.2	24.2	45.4		33
4,600-4,799		15.2	24.2	57.6	3.0	33
4,400-4,599	14.3	2.4	30.9	52.4		42
4,200-4,399		4.3	34.8	60.9		23
4,000-4,199	14.3	4.7	14.3	66.7		21
3,800-3,999			25.0	50.0	25.0	4
3,600-3,799		16.7		66.6	16.7	6
3,400-3,599	12.5	50.0	12.5		25.0	8
3,200-3,399		33.3		33.3	33.3	3
3,000-3,199				100.0		2
2,800-2,999	2.1	10.6	14.9	11.7	60.7	94

Table 69. Average Faculty Salaries by Academic Rank and Sex in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis Only).

Academic Rank	Sex of Faculty Member	Average Salary	Standard Deviation
Professor	Men	$10,601	$2,224
	Women	9,152	1,383
	Total	$10,509	$2,214
Associate Professor	Men	$ 8,041	$ 898
	Women	7,730	939
	Total	$ 7,997	$ 913
Assistant Professor	Men	$ 6,442	$ 689
	Women	6,442	641
	Total	$ 6,442	$ 680
Instructors	Men	$ 5,212	$ 580
	Women	5,130	608
	Total	$ 5,192	$ 585
All Ranks Combined	Men	$ 7,566	$2,298
	Women	6,494	1,439
	Total	$ 7,386	$2,214

Table 70. Average Faculty Salaries by Academic Rank and Sex in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis Only).

Academic Rank	Sex of Faculty Member	Average Salary	Standard Deviation
Professor	Men	$6,277	$1,452
	Women	5,411	1,265
	Total	$6,100	$1,458
Associate Professor	Men	$5,076	$2,082
	Women	5,646	1,067
	Total	$5,143	$1,999
Assistant Professor	Men	$5,088	$1,127
	Women	4,559	1,069
	Total	$4,972	$1,137
Instructors	Men	$4,485	$ 953
	Women	4,125	1,170
	Total	$4,406	$1,015
All Ranks Combined	Men	$4,713	$1,876
	Women	4,367	1,519
	Totals	$4,643	$1,815

the rank of professor, with lesser differences for the assistant professor and instructor. At the rank of associate professor, the average salary paid to women actually exceeds that paid to men by $570. In the community colleges, Table 71, the average salaries paid to men and women are almost identical, being $6,226 for men, and $6,209 for women.

Table 71. Average Faculty Salaries for Each Sex in the Group of Community Colleges, Fall 1957 (10-month Salary Basis Only).

Sex of Faculty Member	Average Salary	Standard Deviation
Men	$6,226	$1,034
Women	6,209	1,200
Total	$6,221	$1,085

On the basis of these data, it appears that a noticable difference in average salary paid at the rank of professor does exist between men and women, but no very substantial differences occur at the other academic ranks. Also, except at the rank of professor, there are no great differences in the standard deviations of the salaries of either group.

Average Salary by Highest Degree Earned

Institutional policies of promotion and salary schedules are generally structured in terms of academic ranks. Although the highest degree earned is more often than not a factor in consideration of employment in a given rank or promotion from one rank to another, this is not a strict principle followed by institutions because factors other than degree earned may qualify a particular faculty member for promotion in rank and thus into a higher salary bracket.

Because a considerable amount of importance is attached to the matter of highest earned degree, an investigation was made of average salaries paid to faculty members holding various degrees. The analysis was made under three categories: first, the doctorate or equivalent degree; second, the master's degree, or second professional degree; and third, the bachelor's degree, or first professional degree. A list of the degrees under each of the categories is found in Appendix B. Because this procedure effects the salary averages found under the three categories, especially the bachelor's degree category, it should be pointed out that the U. S. Office of Education procedure was followed in including under a bachelor's degree and first professional degree those faculty who had the first professional degrees in law and medicine.

Table 72 summarizes the data on average faculty salaries for 10-month salary basis people, by highest earned degree in the three types of institutions.

Table 72. Average Faculty Salary (10-month Basis) by Highest Degree Earned, in Each of the Three Types of Institutions, Fall 1957.

	Doctorate or Equivalent		Master's or Second Professional		Bachelor's or First Professional		Total	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
State-controlled	$7,945	$2,146	$6,746	$1,911	$7,305	$3,089	$7,386	$2,214
Privately Controlled	5,787	1,170	4,775	1,432	2,886	1,988	4,643	1,815
Community Colleges	6,909	892	6,294	976	5,142	1,185	6,232	1,051

In each of the three types of institutions, the holders of the Ph.D. or equivalent doctorate are paid a higher average salary than the holders of the degrees in the other two categories. The average for the holders of the master's degree is higher than for the bachelor's degrees, except in the case of the State-controlled institutions, where, apparently, the holders of the first professional degrees, especially in law and engineering, raise that average above that paid the master's degree holders. This fact is reflected also in the unusually large standard deviation for this group of salaries. With a standard deviation of $3,089 in this category, two-thirds of the salaries in this group would be found in the interval from $4,216 and $10,394.

Salary, Highest Degree, and Subject-area Taught

The detailed analysis of salaries paid according to highest degree earned was carried out for each of 99 subject-area categories. These data are presented in Tables 73, 74, and 75. These tables enable the drawing of comparisons of average salaries paid for the holders of given degrees in the various subject-areas used as categories. For example, the average of the salaries paid to holders of doctorate degrees in the State-controlled institutions is $7,945. Several subject-areas show averages considerably above this and several are considerably below the average for the group. Thus, areas with averages above those for the group are anthropology, botany, business administration, economics, education, certain areas of engineering, forestry and natural resources, geology, law, pharmacy, philosophy, police administration, Spanish, and social work. The areas with averages below those of the group are biology, English, French, mathematics, physical education, social sciences, and communication skills. In the privately controlled institutions the areas with above average salaries are chemistry, physics, psychology, and sociology. In general, the average salaries in the individual subject-areas reflect the supply and demand both, in colleges and universities and in business and industry.

Table 73. Average Faculty Salaries (10-month Basis) by Highest Earned Degree for Each Subject-area in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Subject-area	Doctorate		Master's		Bachelor's		Total	
	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*
Agriculture	$ 8,017	$	$ 7,498	$	$5,800	$	$ 7,490	$
Anatomy	8,000				7,600		7,733	
Anthropology	8,845						8,845	
Architecture	6,960		8,026	3,015	7,652		7,674	2,696
Art and Design	7,410		6,748	1,588	5,800		6,875	1,702
Astronomy	8,147						8,147	
Bacteriology			7,025				7,025	
Biology	6,995	1,322	7,057		5,918		6,947	1,372
Biological Science	7,562		5,825				6,818	
Botany	8,540		4,300		14,740		8,626	
Business Administration	9,072	2,847	6,657	1,572	6,853		7,758	2,562
Chemistry	7,828	2,217	6,278				7,578	2,154
Chemistry & Chem. Engr.	7,796		7,270				7,608	
Classics	8,860						8,860	
Communication Skills	6,658	904	5,803				6,413	944
Economics	8,436	2,524	6,429		5,700		7,737	2,758
Education	8,630	1,853	6,482	1,501	6,625		7,643	2,020
Engineering:								
Aeronautical	8,100		8,357		8,262		8,242	
Chemical	9,211	2,081	6,999		9,600		8,524	2,198
Civil and Sanitary	9,275		7,604	1,789	8,208		8,168	1,964
Electrical	8,567		7,584	1,916	6,110		7,649	2,016
General	6,800		7,948		7,099		7,623	1,952
Geological	6,302		7,312				6,807	
Industrial			7,624		9,955		8,956	
Mechanical	8,702		7,321	1,967	6,941		7,474	2,056
Eng. Mechanics	8,529		7,020	8,850			7,772	2,222
Metallurgical	8,120		7,588		8,005		7,845	
Mining			7,691		5,700		7,293	
Naval and Marine	8,800		9,720		10,397		9,942	
English	7,543	2,076	6,180	1,646	5,753		6,938	2,008
English and Speech	7,877		5,861				6,725	1,377
Entomology	7,550						7,550	
Evaluation Services	7,867						7,867	
Field Services			6,900				6,900	
Fine Arts	9,748		7,092				8,041	
Foreign Studies	7,651		4,500				7,231	
Forestry & Nat. Resources	9,194		6,995				8,333	
French	7,371		6,220				7,042	
General Education	6,308		5,902				5,989	

Table 73, Continued.

Subject-area	Doctorate Mean	Doctorate S.D.*	Master's Mean	Master's S.D.*	Bachelor's Mean	Bachelor's S.D.*	Total Mean	Total S.D.*
Geography	$ 7,738	$	$ 5,832	$	$	$	$ 6,897	$1,923
Geology	9,196	2,420	5,033		6,865		8,747	2,596
German	7,708	2,525	4,374				7,461	2,582
History	7,828	2,312	5,919		7,550		7,638	2,307
Home Economics	8,392		6,418	1,402			6,487	1,451
Hotel Administration	8,500		6,700		4,933		6,530	
Humanities	6,820	1,368	4,800		5,200		6,632	1,414
Industrial Arts	7,812		6,991		5,738		7,018	1,162
Industrial Technology	7,717		6,640		6,279		6,791	864
Journalism	7,516		7,846		8,803		8,265	
Laboratory Schools	7,300		6,154	759	5,182		5,981	848
Language, Modern & For.	7,903	1,996	5,577	1,270	4,305		6,903	2,090
Law	10,000		13,963		12,528		13,110	4,097
Library Science	7,800		6,637		12,500		7,305	
Mathematics and Stat.	7,411	1,855	6,205	994	4,898		6,961	1,879
Mortuary Science			5,996				5,996	
Music	7,756	1,941	6,964	1,696	9,881		7,461	2,030
Natural Science	6,597	1,145	5,258		4,300		6,149	1,241
Nursing			6,651	1,301	5,009		6,538	1,329
Occupational Therapy			6,394		5,925		6,300	
Pharmacy	8,582		7,253		11,000		8,511	
Philosophy	8,705		5,067		4,900		8,116	2,547
Physical Education	7,694		6,734	1,312	5,787		6,736	1,399
Physical Science	8,054		6,500		5,500		7,425	
Physics	8,238	2,624	6,443		5,800		7,790	2,506
Physics and Chemistry	7,630		6,806				7,264	
Police Administration	9,000		7,033		7,940		7,880	
Political Science	7,617	2,346	5,783		7,510		7,371	2,291
Psychology	8,006	2,414	6,054				7,811	2,403
Psychology and Education	7,282	1,087	6,777	675	5,775		6,964	912
Slavic	6,925		5,200				6,734	
Social Sciences	7,055	1,285	6,435	1,136	3,240		6,812	1,325
Social Work	8,824		8,845				8,835	
Sociology	7,943		5,167				7,634	2,483
Sociology and Anthropolgy	7,223		5,894				6,921	
Spanish	8,989		6,565				8,181	
Speech and Drama	7,616	1,539	6,108	1,742	4,600		6,848	1,815
Veterinary Medicine	7,240		7,210				7,225	
Zoology	8,032	2,420	5,805				7,852	2,424
Averages	$7,945	$2,146	$6,746	$1,911	$7,305	$3,089	$7,386	$2,214

*Standard Deviation - arithmetic mean and standard deviation computed from ungrouped data. No standard deviations are computed when the number is less than 25.

Table 74. Average Faculty Salaries (10-month Basis) by Highest Earned Degree for Each Subject-area in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957.

Subject-area	Doctorate		Master's		Bachelor's		Total	
	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*
Anthropology	$ 8,450	$	$ 5,100	$	$	$	$ 7,333	$
Art and Design			4,994				4,994	
Biology	5,861		5,165		1,855		4,393	1,906
Business Administration	5,800		4,364		2,634		3,573	1,981
Chemistry	6,095		4,386		2,425		4,118	2,141
Classics	4,500		4,300		4,500		4,433	
Economics	5,449		5,592		1,300		4,725	
Education	6,015		5,130		1,550		5,159	1,736
Engineering, All Types	6,800		6,388		5,420		5,754	
Architectural					7,200		7,200	
Chemical					1,000		1,000	
Civil and Sanitary	6,800						6,800	
Electrical					6,300		6,300	
General			5,650				5,650	
Mechanical			7,125				7,125	
English	5,610		4,609	1,077	3,723		4,856	1,306
French	5,420		5,698				5,559	
German	5,940						5,940	
Greek	6,450				4,500		5,800	
History	5,968		4,729		1,300		4,933	
Home Economics			4,690				4,690	
Humanities	4,900		4,333		2,550		3,986	
Journalism			5,200				5,200	
Language, Modern & For.	5,498		3,770		2,800		4,291	1,897
Latin			4,000				4,000	
Law			6,500		7,500		7,100	
Library Science			4,600				4,600	
Mathematics and Stat.	5,655		5,099		2,655		4,377	1,758
Music	6,200		4,835		2,284		4,203	1,547
Philosophy	5,466		5,023		1,325		4,858	
Physical Education			5,551		4,474		5,192	
Physics	6,870		4,033		1,298		4,905	
Political Science	5,350		5,267				5,298	
Psychology	6,258		5,212		1,833		5,105	1,928
Psychology and Education	5,400						5,400	

Table 74, Continued.

	Doctorate		Master's		Bachelor's		Total	
Subject-area	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*
Religion, Theology	$ 4,939	$	$ 4,109	$	$ 2,973	$	$ 4,247	$2,122
Science and Math.	5,000				2,905		3,603	
Social Sciences	1,052						1,052	
Social Work	5,100		5,200				5,167	
Sociology	6,194		5,232		3,315		5,307	
Spanish	5,200		4,800				5,067	
Speech and Drama	4,800		5,127		4,750		5,064	
Averages	$5,787	$1,170	$4,775	$1,423	$2,886	$1,988	$4,643	$1,815

*Standard Deviation - arithmetic mean and standard deviation computed from ungrouped data. No standard deviations are computed when the number is less than 25.

Table 75. Average Faculty Salaries (10-month Basis) by Highest Earned Degree for Each Subject-area in the Group of Community Colleges, Fall 1957.

Subject-area	Doctorate		Master's		Bachelor's		Total	
	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*
Art and Design	$	$	$ 5,896	$	$ 5,425	$	$ 5,791	$
Biology	5,252		6,002				5,944	
Biological Science	8,365		6,422				6,746	
Botany			6,850				6,850	
Business Administration			6,538	953	5,067		6,428	983
Chemistry	5,900		6,326		4,880		6,222	
Communication Skills			5,200				5,200	
Economics			6,294				6,294	
Education			7,117				7,117	
Electrical Engineering			6,063				6,063	
General Engineering			6,208		4,140		5,965	
Mechanical Engineering			6,000				6,000	
English	6,963		6,353	824	4,500		6,353	592
French			6,192				6,192	
Geography			6,496				6,496	
Geology			6,300				6,300	
German			6,013				6,013	
History	6,025		6,347		4,938		6,176	
Home Economics			5,500		6,533		6,016	
Humanities	5,850						5,850	
Industrial Arts			5,721		4,780		5,486	
Industrial Technology			6,865		5,828		6,621	
Language, Modern & For.			6,714				6,714	
Library Science			6,450				6,450	
Mathematics & Physics			5,806				5,806	
Mathematics & Statistics	6,700		6,200	929	4,915		6,099	
Music			5,294		4,325		5,156	
Natural Science			5,867				5,867	
Nursing			5,689		4,368		5,076	
Philosophy			4,450				4,450	
Physical Education			6,090		5,192		5,790	
Physical Science			6,352				6,352	
Physics			6,664		4,718		6,178	
Physics and Chemistry			6,425				6,425	
Political Science			6,120		6,300		6,142	

Table 75, Continued.

Subject-area	Doctorate		Master's		Bachelor's		Total	
	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*	Mean	S.D.*
Psychology	$	$	$ 6,522	$	$ 6,255	$	$ 6,446	$
Psychology and Educ.	6,685						6,685	
Science and Math.	7,428		6,446	872	5,790		6,614	929
Social Sciences	7,052		6,175	1,054	5,700		6,301	1,062
Sociology			6,017				6,017	
Spanish			6,300				6,300	
Speech and Drama			6,801				6,801	
Zoology			6,850				6,850	
Averages	$6,909	$892	$6,294	$976	$5,142	$1,185	$6,232	$1,051

*Standard Deviation - arithmetic mean and standard deviation computed from ungrouped data. No standard deviations are computed when the number is less than 25.

Average Salaries by Level of Instruction

The final sort of analysis made was that of average salaries paid to faculty members at each level of instruction in the various subject-areas. Table 76 summarizes these data for the three types of institutions.

Table 76. Average Salaries of Faculty for Each Level of Instruction by Subject-area, in Each of the Three Types of Institutions, Fall 1957.

	Undergraduate Only		Undergraduate and Graduate		Graduate Level Only	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
State-controlled	$6,347	$1,391	$8,137	$2,139	$10,885	$3,502
Privately Controlled	4,552	1,829	5,228	1,632	5,880	983
Community Colleges	6,232	1,051				

Table 76 exhibits the sort of relationship which would be expected on the basis of the results obtained in the analyses of rank and highest earned degree. That is, there is a definite progression of average salaries from the lowest for the faculty teaching undergraduate courses only, to those teaching both undergraduate and graduate, and to the group teaching graduate courses only. In the case of the faculty teaching graduate courses only, the rather large standard deviation of these salaries in the State-controlled institutions indicates that two-thirds of these salaries are found in the interval between $7,383 and $14,387, a range probably reflecting the differing levels of graduate work offered in several of the State-controlled institutions. The data on average salaries paid at each level of instruction in each subject-area are shown in Tables 77 and 78.

Table 77. Average Faculty Salaries for Each Level of Instruction, and for Each Subject-area, in the Group of State-controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Contract Basis).

Subject-area	Undergraduate Only		Graduate Only		Those Teaching at Both Levels	
	Average	Standard Deviation*	Average	Standard Deviation*	Average	Standard Deviation*
Agriculture	$ 6,684	$	$	$	$ 8,757	$
Anatomy	4,400				9,400	
Architecture	7,090	2,058	15,215		8,445	
Art and Design	6,062	1,393	7,488		7,498	1,669
Astronomy	7,365				9,710	
Bacteriology	7,025					
Biology	6,659	1,347			7,315	
Biological Science	6,410		9,000		7,450	
Botany	7,730				8,814	
Business Administration	6,346	1,152	8,719		8,920	2,813
Chemistry	6,605	1,467	7,733		8,153	2,329
Chemistry and Chem.Engr.	6,939				7,876	
Classics					8,860	
Communication Skills	6,401	945			7,100	
Economics	5,818	1,190	13,000		9,013	2,710
Education	6,086	1,308	9,603		8,239	1,681
Engineering:						
Aeronautical	9,063		8,500		8,056	
Chemical	7,472		12,785		8,378	
Civil and Sanitary	6,408				8,670	1,822
Electrical	6,772	1,543	10,233		8,824	
General	7,342				9,864	
Geological	6,834				6,752	
Industrial	8,000		15,000		7,938	
Mechanical	6,530	1,441			8,922	2,013
Engineering Mechanics	6,832				8,412	
Metallurgical	6,702				8,073	
Mining	6,841				9,100	
Naval and Marine					9,942	
English	6,179	1,488	11,416		8,022	1,956
English and Speech	6,309	1,082	8,050		9,081	
Entomology					7,550	
Evaluation Services	7,860		7,900			
Field Services	6,900					
Fine Arts	4,540				8,624	
Foreign Studies	3,600				7,490	
French	7,300				6,999	
Forestry and Nat. Res.	6,545		10,232		8,858	
Geography	6,266		7,575		7,451	

Table 77, Continued.

Subject-area	Undergraduate Only		Graduate Only		Those Teaching at Both Levels	
	Average	Standard Deviation*	Average	Standard Deviation*	Average	Standard Deviation*
	$	$	$	$	$	$
Geology	6,788		11,520		9,184	2,509
General Education	5,989					
German	5,251				8,234	
History	6,101				8,094	2,299
Home Economics	6,103	1,159	5,600		7,255	
Hotel Administration	5,660				7,400	
Humanities	6,415	1,345			8,038	
Industrial Arts	6,840				7,875	
Industrial Technology	6,460				7,538	
Journalism	6,508		7,350		8,682	
Laboratory Schools	5,950	828	7,400			
Languages, Modern & For.	5,701	1,154	10,175		8,654	1,859
Law	8,231		13,737	3,941	10,713	
Library Science	6,581		7,118		7,912	
Mortuary Science	5,966					
Music	5,998	1,392	9,960		7,518	1,890
Natural Science	6,200	1,215			4,100	
Nursing	5,723		8,121		7,289	
Occupational Therapy	5,850				6,975	
Pharmacy	7,467		8,800		9,870	
Philsophy	6,332				8,456	
Physical Education	6,369	1,215	9,762		7,896	1,122
Physical Science	7,144				7,650	
Physics	6,103	1,136	12,246		8,347	2,055
Physics and Chemistry	7,261				7,275	
Police Administration	7,433				8,550	
Political Science	5,758				7,752	2,369
Psychology	5,617		9.883		7,947	2,394
Psychology and Education	6,699	757			7,666	
Slavic	7,800				6,600	
Social Sciences	6,651	1,275	7,575		7,529	
Social Work	6,400		9,875		7,929	
Sociology	5,694		11,912		7,222	
Sociology and Anthr.	5,050				7,337	
Spanish	5,787				8,865	

Table 77, Continued.

Subject-area	Undergraduate Only		Graduate Only		Those Teaching at Both Levels	
	Average	Standard Deviation*	Average	Standard Deviation*	Average	Standard Deviation*
	$	$	$	$	$	$
Speech and Drama	5,801	1,100	11,340		7,431	1,817
Veterinary Medicine	7,000				7,250	
Zoology	5,779		15,400		7,875	2,088
Average	$6,347	$1,391	$10,885	$3,502	$8,137	$2,139

*Standard Deviation - arithmetic mean and standard deviation computed from ungrouped data. No standard deviations are computed when the number is less than 25.

Table 78. Average Faculty Salaries for Each Level of Instruction, and for Each Subject-area, in the Group of Privately Controlled Institutions, Fall 1957 (10-month Contract Basis).

Subject-area	Undergraduate Only		Graduate Only		Those Teaching at Both Levels	
	Average	Standard Deviation*	Average	Standard Deviation*	Average	Standard Deviation*
Anthropology	$ 5,100	$	$	$	$ 8,450	$
Art and Design	4,994					
Biology	4,267	1,978			5,447	
Business Administration	3,539	1,866			3,698	
Chemistry	4,118	2,141				
Classics	4,433					
Economics	4,699				5,108	
Education	5,277				4,616	
Architectural Engineering	5,400					
Chemical Engineering	1,000					
Civil and Sanitary Engr.	6,800					
Electrical Engineering	6,300					
General Engineering	5,650					
Mechanical Engineering	7,125					
Engineering Mechanics	6,000					
English	4,833	1,349			5,166	
French	5,559					
German	5,940					
Greek	5,800					
History	4,896				5,285	
Home Economics	4,538				5,300	
Humanities	3,986					
Journalism	5,200					
Latin	4,000					
Languages, Modern & For.	4,195	1,978			5,083	
Law	7,625		5,000			
Library Science	4,600					
Mathematics and Statistics	4,265	1,816			5,385	
Music	4,203	1,547				
Philosophy	4,810				5,248	
Physical Education	5,082				7,375	
Physics	4,905					
Political Science	5,402				5,194	
Psychology	4,242		6,533		6,042	
Psychology and Education	5,400					

Table 78, Continued.

Subject-area	Undergraduate Only		Graduate Only		Those Teaching at Both Levels	
	Average	Standard Deviation*	Average	Standard Deviation*	Average	Standard Deviation*
Religion, Theology	$ 4,225	$	$ 4,800	$	$4,200	$
Science and Math.	3,905				3,000	
Social Sciences	1,052					
Social Work	5,100				5,200	
Sociology	4,999				7,000	
Spanish	5,067					
Speech and Drama	5,093				4,600	
Average	$4,552	$1,829	$5,880	$983	$5,228	$1,632

*Standard Deviation - arithmetic mean and standard deviation computed from ungrouped data. No standard deviations are computed when the number is less than 25.

The analyses by academic rank, highest earned degree, and level of instruction indicate that within each of the three types of institutions, there exist rather logical salary differentials appropriate to rank, degree, level of teaching, and professional experience. The concern which confronts these institutions is, of course, that of increasing all of these salaries to reflect the national supply and demand.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It was pointed out in Chapter I of this report that quality of the educational program has always been the primary concern of institutions of higher education. This has been evident on the national level, and certainly has been true in the State of Michigan. Various factors which constitute a college or university contribute to its excellence or lack thereof. By far the most important and vital factor in the attainment of institutional excellence and prestige are the faculty members. The quality of instruction, research, and scholarly activity by faculty members are direct determiners of institutional prestige.

Because the faculty is the one single factor most responsible for the quality of the total educational service of the institution, it is imperative that members of these faculties be the most competent, able, and highly qualified individuals. Reference in Chapter I was made to a number of research findings indicating that a decreasing number of the most able college graduates are finding their way into the college-teaching profession. Not only is there a temporary decline in the number of graduates with the doctorate, but over the past two decades the economic status of the college-teaching profession has declined to the point where it finds itself in an unfavorably competitive position with comparable professions in business, industry, law, and medicine.

There are, perhaps, three possible resolutions to the problem, (1) the limitation of college attendance to levels which can be served by the number of faculty available, (2) knowingly compromising the quality of higher education by lowering quality standards for faculty, or (3) the provision of needed financial support to our colleges and universities for faculty salaries so that the profession of college teaching will regain at least its former economic status and appeal as a career choice. Unquestionably, the first two possibilities just have no place in the scheme of American, societal expectations. The only solution appears to be the provision of adequate funds which must be provided by philanthropic donors, taxpayers, the Legislature, and other governmental agencies. This study was undertaken with the conviction that these citizens could make their wisest decisions if properly informed about the nature of the problem and the qualifications of faculty members now serving in the colleges and universities of Michigan.

Data for this report were gathered by means of a single-page information schedule. These data were concerned with the educational background of faculty members, years of service, department and level of instruction, age and sex, academic rank, and salaries paid to members of institutional faculties.

Responses to the request for data were received regarding faculty members in 56 of the 62 institutions of higher education in Michigan to whom they were distributed. These institutions enrolled 99.3 per cent of all students in Michigan colleges and universities in the fall of 1957. Completed forms were received for 7,450 faculty members. Participating in the study were all ten State-controlled institutions, the fifteen community colleges, and 31 privately controlled institutions. The privately controlled institutions submitted data voluntarily, as in previous studies in the Survey Series.

Some of the main conclusions and observations which can be made on the basis of the data are listed below:

1. Sex. The distributions of male and female faculty members show that in the privately controlled institutions and community colleges there is a somewhat larger percentage of women than in the State-controlled institutions. The percentages in the privately controlled institutions and community colleges are very similar to national figures. The State-controlled institutions have somewhat higher percentages of men on their faculties than colleges and universities throughout the country, the percentages being 81.3 and 77.9, respectively.

2. Age. The average age of college and university faculties in Michigan is 41.2 years, with a standard deviation of 11.2 years. The averages in the three types of institutions are practically identical. There are variations in the average age of faculties at the individual institutions, with Central Michigan College having the highest average age of 44.6 years and Michigan State University having the lowest average age of 39.4 years. In all three types of institutions the women faculty members are somewhat older, on the average, than the men. Of the entire group of faculty members in the State, 7.61 per cent are 60 years or older and 24.5 per cent are 50 years or older. This fact is worthy of note when considering the State's future needs for replacement of retired faculty personnel only.

3. Academic Rank. In the State-controlled institutions, as a group, the percentages in the various ranks are professor, 19.0 per cent, associate professor, 19.1 per cent, assistant professor, 28.2 per cent, instructor, 18.9 per cent, and "Other", 14.7 per cent. The percentages of faculty members in each of the ranks at the State-controlled institutions appear to reflect rather conservative practices in the matter of promotion and assignment to each of the ranks, especially

the two upper ranks. None of the community colleges in Michigan uses the usual academic rank designations. Among the privately controlled institutions there are wide variations in the distributions of academic rank. Some of the institutions do not assign ranks to faculty members; others have unusually large percentages in one or two of the upper ranks.

There is a very close relationship between academic rank and age of faculty members. Of the 2,444 faculty members who are less than 40 years old, only 72 have the rank of full professor. Of 696 faculty members who are over 55 years of age, only 17 hold the rank of instructor.

In the State-controlled institutions, as a group, the percentage of women faculty members holding the upper two academic ranks -- professor and associate professor -- especially full professor, is distinctly smaller than the percentage of men faculty members holding these ranks. In the privately controlled institutions, the percentages of men faculty members and of women faculty members who hold the various academic ranks are very similar.

4. Years of Service. Of the 7,450 faculty reported in service, 50.3 per cent have been at the institution of present employment less than 4 years; 44.4 per cent have been there less than 3 years; and only 14.5 per cent have been in service at their present institution more than ten years. These percentages would appear to reflect the rapidly expanding enrollments in many of the institutions of higher education, especially in the community colleges where 57.7 per cent of the faculty in service in the fall of 1957 have been at their present institutions less than 3 years. These high percentages of relatively new faculty have specific implications for administrative attention to the orientation of these new staff people to the procedures and traditions of the institution.

5. Highest Earned Degree. The State-controlled institutions of Michigan, with 45.3 per cent of their faculties holding the doctorate degree, are well above the national percentage reported for the fall of 1957. In particular, the University of Michigan and Michigan State University stand out with their very high percentages of doctorates on their staffs. They have 58.3 per cent and 54.3 per cent, respectively, of their faculties with the doctor's degree. The retention of this level of faculty quality will continue to place increasing demands upon instructional budget expenditures in the years just ahead. It was pointed out earlier that not only is the number of doctorates produced annually decreasing, but an increasing number of these graduates are being attracted into non-teaching positions in government, business, and industry.

The privately controlled institutions, as a group, have less than half the percentage of doctorates on their staffs that the State-controlled institutions have, although several of the privately controlled institutions do have percentages comparable with a number of the State-controlled institutions. Somewhat lower percentages would generally be expected in view of the fact that all but two or three of the privately controlled institutions are exclusively undergraduate, while the proportionately larger graduate programs of some of the State-controlled institutions would demand larger numbers of staff members with the doctorate degree.

6. Source of Highest Earned Degree. Over 50 per cent of the faculty members in the privately controlled institutions and in the State-controlled institutions of Michigan have their highest earned degree from an institution outside the State of Michigan. In the main, the community colleges procure their instructional staffs from in-Michigan institutions. The University of Michigan has a remarkably large fraction (43.0 per cent) of its faculty with the highest earned degree from

that institution, while only 1.7 per cent of the University of Michigan faculty members had their highest earned degree from another Michigan institution.

7. Academic Rank and Highest Earned Degree. The data of this study give no support to the notion that faculty members with degrees from out-of-State institutions receive preference in considerations for promotion.

8. Part-time Faculty. Michigan colleges and universities, as a group, employ a little over 20 per cent of their instructional staffs on a part-time basis. The use of part-time staff is a highly desirable way to fill partial or specialized vacancies if attention is given to proper qualifications. This is especially true of institutions located in metropolitan areas.

9. Highest Degree and Teaching Level. In the State-controlled institutions, of all the faculty members responsible for undergraduate teaching only, 23.7 per cent have the doctor's degree and 60.0 per cent have the master's degree, while in the privately controlled institutions 17.8 per cent have the doctorate and 51.1 per cent have the master's degree. In the State-controlled institutions 16.3 per cent of the faculty responsible for undergraduate teaching only have no degree higher than the bachelor's, while in the privately controlled institutions 31.1 per cent have only the bachelor's degree.

10. Salaries Paid. (A) The average salary paid to full-time faculty members on a 10-month contract basis in the State-controlled institutions is $7,386; in the privately controlled institutions it is $4,643; and in the community colleges it is $6,232. The average salary paid to faculty members in the colleges and universities of Michigan as a group is $6,937. The average salaries, paid to

college and university faculty in Michigan, are similar to faculty salaries in the country, and hence similar in the extent to which they have fallen far behind other, comparable professions such as law, medicine, and dentistry. Less than 10 per cent of all full-time, 10-month contract faculty in Michigan colleges and universities were paid more than $10,000 per year.

The imminent, large-scale increases in enrollment during the next decade or two, the recent decline in the number of doctorates being produced by American universities, the increasing number of holders of advanced degrees who select professional careers other than college teaching, the large numbers of faculty members moving out of the college-teaching field, and the spiraling cost of living are factors which must be faced by governmental agencies, private donors, and college and university administrators.

a. Certainly, few will agree that any limitation of opportunity for a higher education for American youth would be a wise position to take. Hence the anticipated enrollment increases are bound to materialize.

b. Efforts are being made to increase the number of doctor's degree graduates during the next ten years, especially those intending to go into college teaching. Several fellowship programs now being implemented may foster additional interest in this area.

This will provide a potential source of teachers for our colleges. Whether this potential reservoir can be utilized will depend on several other factors.

c. Unless financial and other rewards in the college-teaching profession are brought to the level of other, comparable professions, there is little hope that an increasing number of qualified men and women will select college teaching as a career.

d. The solution to the problem of an increasing number of doctor's degree holders moving into other fields of work appears to be related directly to the sharp decline in the economic status of the college-teaching profession during the past twenty years.

In a recent publication[1] it is pointed out that the percentage of new faculty members with the doctorate employed in 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1956 has been steadily decreasing. In 1953 the new faculty employed with the doctorate constituted 31.4 per cent of the group; in 1954 it was 28.4 per cent; in 1955 it was 26.7 per cent; and in 1956 it was 23.5 per cent. There was, of course, a corresponding increase in the percentage of faculty employed in those years with the master's degree as the highest qualification. This decrease in the rate of doctorates being employed by colleges and universities is alarming, to say the least. To the extent that the doctorate reflects faculty quality, it means that colleges and universities in the country are now being staffed with individuals of lower qualifications than in the past. The reasons for this decrease are at least two. First, there has been a decline in the number of actual doctorates produced in the universities and colleges. Second, and perhaps more important than the first, is the fact that almost half of the graduates holding the doctorate are entering other professions -- not college teaching.

The latter fact is closely related to the obvious lag in the salaries paid to these individuals by colleges and universities as compared to private business and industry. The biennial studies of faculty salaries by the American Association of University Professors and other organizations, indicate that, although salary increases have occurred in the college-teaching field, they have by no means kept up with the spiraling economy.

---

[1] National Education Association, Teacher Supply and Demand in Colleges and Universities, 1957.

Not only has the purchasing power of the salary dollar paid to college and university faculties lagged behind other professions such as law, dentistry, and medicine, but it has lagged deplorably behind the gain in purchasing power for the Nation as a whole. In fact, in the 28 privately controlled institutions used as a basis of analysis by the American Association of University Professors, there was a loss in purchasing power. The gain by five State universities -- selected because of their exceptionally good salary situations -- was only 9 per cent as compared to the 79 per cent gain in purchasing power for the Nation as a whole.

It is at this point that adequate, financial provision will have to be forthcoming to enable the colleges and universities to attract and retain the most able scholars in the college-teaching ranks.

(B). The extremely low average salaries of the faculties in the privately controlled institutions is cause for deep concern. The provision of adequate funds, immediately, in order to improve faculty salaries in the privately controlled institutions of Michigan deserves the most active and vigorous support of philanthropic donors, alumni, church groups, business, industry, labor organizations, and all citizens interested in the future welfare of the State.

(C). Michigan institutions of higher education have salary levels at the two lower academic ranks comparable to national averages, but are lagging behind at the two upper ranks, professor and associate professor. Especial attention is needed for the adjustment of salaries in these two ranks if the Michigan institutions can expect to compete for staff with the better institutions in the country.

(D). Average salaries paid to male faculty members are somewhat higher, especially at the rank of professor and associate professor, than those paid to female faculty members. The difference in the State-controlled institutions is $1,072; in the privately controlled institutions it is $246; and in the community colleges it is only $17.

(E). The average salaries of faculty members with a Ph.D. or comparable degree is $7,945 in the State-controlled institutions, $5,787 in the privately controlled institutions, and $6,909 in the community colleges. Considering the number of years of preparation required for the attainment of the Ph.D. degree, these averages emphasize again the unfavorable competitive position occupied by the college-teaching profession.

Conclusion

In conclusion it can be pointed out that, in the past, the State of Michigan has been favorably inclined to support the development of its higher education programs at the highest qualitative level. The college and university administrators have utilized the available funds effectively in the procurement of highly qualified instructional staffs.

During the next decade or two, however, these efforts of financial support will have to be intensified and increased substantially if these high levels of quality are to be retained and improved.

Appendix A

Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education
P. O. Box 240, State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan

Instructions for Filling out Form III-A, Individual Record of Faculty Members in Service Fall Term or October, 1957

The purpose of this report is to provide data for an analysis of institutional faculties. The data will not be used for analyzing teaching loads or instructional costs. No report will be made that in any way identifies any individual faculty member. The analysis that will be reported will be in terms of totals, averages, and ranges for the institution as a whole or for various groupings of faculty members within the institution. The original data on individual faculty members will be retained as confidential in the files of the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education.

General Instructions.

A record form is to be completed for each faculty member in service during the fall term or semester of 1957 who is to be reported according to the categories below. Include only faculty members who normally give some instructional service during the year, and report all such members of the faculty except as explained in this paragraph. Exclude faculty members whose full time is given to research or other non-teaching duties. Include graduate assistants, lecturers, and other "fringe" members of the faculty only if given full responsibility for a class, laboratory section, quiz section, discussion group, etc., for which credit is given and a separate grade report is submitted. Include faculty members whose only service is in extension classes, but only if the extension classes are given for credit. Exclude faculty members whose only teaching on campus or in extension is in non-credit courses. Exclude medical school, dental school, and veterinary medical school faculty members unless they also give instruction in other academic departments. Include department heads but exclude deans unless they teach half-time or more. Faculty members on leave during the fall of 1957 may be included or excluded at the option of the reporting institution.

Complete one form for each faculty member. If he is assigned to two or more departments, indicate the department of his major responsibility in the space provided in Item D.

In Item C, the identification of the faculty member can be by any means that is convenient to the institution, either by name, payroll number, or by any other convenient but distinguishing designation.

In Item E report the academic rank of the faculty member by placing a check mark in the appropriate space.

In Item G, report the age at last birthday.

In Item H, report the total years of faculty service at this institution prior to the fall term or semester of 1957. If service is less than one year, report zero; if one year, but less than two, report one, if two years, but less than three, report two; and so on.

In Item I, report the regular annual salary in effect for the faculty member in the fall term or semester of 1957. If the faculty member does not devote full-time to instruction, report his regular salary or the full-time-equivalent, if he is on a part-time salary schedule. Do not include extra payment for extension classes, correspondence study, or other duties unless such assignments are included in the regular salary as part of the regular load.

In Item L, report the highest degree earned by the faculty member. Standard abbreviations may be used.

Please make no entries in the first column, which is reserved for IBM coding.

Please return the completed form by or before October 30, 1957 to:

Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education
P.O. Box 240, State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan

Form III-A. Individual Record of Faculty Members in Service at Main Campus or in Extension Classes in the Fall Term or October, 1957.

IBM Code Column

1,2.__________ A. Name of Institution______________________________

3. __________ B. Name and Title of Person Reporting______________________________

4-7.__________ C. Name (or other Identification of Faculty Member)______________

8-9.__________ D. Department to Which Assigned______________________________

10. __________ E. Academic Rank:

1.____________Professor
2.____________Associate Professor
3.____________Assistant Professor
4.____________Instructor
5.____________Lecturer
6.____________Other (Specify)

11.__________ F. Sex:

1.____________Male
2.____________Female

12,13.________ G. Age in Years______________

14,15.________ H. Years of Service at this Institution__________________years.

16-20.________ I. Salary (for regular 1957-58 contract) $____________________

21.__________ J. Salary Basis:

1.______________9-month academic year
2.______________11-12 months basis
3.______________Part-time

22.__________ K. Teaching Level:

1.______________Undergraduate only
2.______________Graduate Only
3.______________Undergraduate and graduate

23-24.________ L. Highest Degree Earned:______________________

24.__________ M. Highest Degree Earned at:

1.______________________This Institution
2.______________________Another Michigan Institution
3.______________________An Institution Outside of Michigan

26.____________ N. Service this term at:
1.__________Main Campus 2.__________Branch or Extension 3.___Both

Appendix B

Code for Highest Degree Earned

1. Ph.D. or comparable degree:

Ed.D	Doctor of Education
Ph.D.	Doctor of Philosophy
D.P.H.	Doctor of Public Health
S.T.D.	Doctor of Sacred Theology
D.H.S.	Doctor of Health and Safety
D.B.A.	Doctor of Business Administration

2. Master's or comparable Second Professional Degree:

M.A.	Master of Arts
LL.M.	Master of Laws
M.M.	Master of Music
M.S.	Master of Science
Th.M.	Master of Theology
M.F.A.	Master of Fine Arts
M.Ed.	Master of Education
Ph.M.	Master of Philosophy
S.T.M.	Master of Sacred Theology
M.L.S.	Master of Library Science
S.J.D.	Doctor of Juridical Science
M.S.E.	Master of Science and Education
M.B.A.	Master of Business Administration
M.H.A.	Master of Hospital Administration
M.S.A.E.	Master of Science and Agricultural Engineering

3. Bachelor's or comparable First Professional Degree:

J.D.	Doctor of Laws
B.A.	Bachelor of Arts
LL.B.	Bachelor of Laws
M.D.	Doctor of Medicine
B.S.	Bachelor of Science
S.T.B.	Bachelor of Theology
B.D.	Bachelor of Divinity
B.F.A.	Bachelor of Fine Arts
Ph.B.	Bachelor of Philosophy
D.D.S.	Doctor of Dental Surgery
B.L.S.	Bachelor of Library Science
D.V.M.	Doctor of Veterinary Medicine
B.S.N.	Bachelor of Science in Nursing
B.S.E.	Bachelor of Science and Education
B.M.E.	Bachelor of Mechanical Engineering
B.S.E.E.	Bachelor of Electrical Engineering
B.S.I.E.	Bachelor of Industrial Engineering